CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1936. Vol. XXVI.

IN MEMORIAM

PERCY DEARMER, D.D.

BY the death of Dr. Percy Dearmer, Canon of Westminster, on the 29th of May, the Church of England suffers a grievous loss. Possessed of many gifts and graces, he was one of the most influential as he was one of the most devoted of her sons. Deep human sympathy, pure love of beauty, stern detestation of insincerity were his outstanding characteristics. He began his clerical career in Victorian England by being both a socialist and an aesthete—a very inauspicious start for a clergyman. And it is surprising with his intense nature that he did not end his career by becoming either a Marxian Communist or a Roman Catholic. But he was preserved from these fates by his deep love of England and its Church, which debarred him from a servile adoption of continental methods and ideals, whether in politics or religion. As a consequence he became, like Samuel Barnett, Hastings Rashdall, Charles Gore and Scott Holland, a Christian Socialist of the Maurician type and was for twenty-one years in London the energetic secretary of the Christian Social Union. He strove to awaken the minds of his fellow-clergy especially, to the need for social reform based on Christian principles and modern scientific knowledge.

His devotion to beauty, combined with his love for the National Church, inspired him to purge Public Worship from ugliness, slovenliness and frippery. If Dearmer disliked the bareness and even the comfortable irreverence of Evangelical worship, he detested far more an Anglo-Catholicism which seemed only capable of expressing its liturgical devotion by a servile imitation of mediaeval and modern Romanism. He realized, however, that liturgical reform could only be the outcome of sound liturgical education. As a consequence he took up the study of liturgiology methodically and became master of great stores of liturgical erudition, but his purpose differed from that of a Brightman or a John Wordsworth. They were devoted to pure research: Dearmer was the practical ceremonialist, bent on discovering the best way of ordering Divine Worship in the Church of England. This took effect in two ways — the publication of *The Parson's Handbook*, and the impressive and attractive Services in the Church of St. Mary, Primrose Hill, where he was vicar.

The Parson's Handbook had a wide influence and went through twelve editions, while volume after volume on liturgical subjects appeared from Dearmer's pen as the years passed by. It definitely established in the minds of many clergymen the ideal of an English Use in distinction from that of Rome. He made it clear to those who would be at pains to understand the distinction that an English clergyman might be a ritualist without being a Romanist. Yet Dearmer, as a Churchman, was interested in much more than the Church's ritual. Many years ago, the writer of this notice on first meeting Dearmer said to him: 'I feel I know you quite well because I know your *Parson's Handbook*.' Dearmer replied: '*The Parson's Handbook* is a very poor introduction to me.'

Dearmer was a great religious teacher and particularly of the young — in his way, an English Dupanloup. His five volumes of *Lessons on the Way* are of absorbing interest to the practical religious teacher of youth, and it is to be hoped that they will be re-published in a uniform edition and secure that wide circulation which they deserve. He became increasingly impressed with the need for truth in religious teaching and the necessity

of theological reform. It was this which led him to join the Modern Churchmen's Union.

Dearmer recognized too that the hymns sung in our churches were the most potent factors in the propagation and maintenance of an out-of-date theology, and he directed his attention to the improvement of our church hymnody. He took a large part in the production of *The English Hymnal*, but his heart's desire was expressed in the publication of *Songs of Praise*, where noble English words and fine music were united to sincere religious expression. The concluding words of his last essay, published since his death, dealing with Public Worship and the Creeds,[1] indicate the strength of his conviction of the need for dogmatic reform.

> 'The strength of science to-day is that it refuses to be fixed by past pronouncements and is free of false cosmogonies. . . . Theologians are suspect; their most honest investigations carry little weight because of the fixity that is unjustly attributed to them. Although the very reason for their existence is faith, and faith looks forward, yet the formal parade of belief which is imposed upon them produces the continual impression that they cannot extricate themselves from a past that died with Copernicus. For that is the result of reciting creeds in church . . . Their spell is thrown over even strong minds, with the result, as we are seeing to-day, that born leaders of religion who are in other ways wise and reasonable, are willing to see the fellowship of Jesus Christ dwindle into nothingness rather than abate a jot from the Nicene interpretation of His person. If such a temper should spread, then the urgent work of all who put Christ first, and are trying to follow Him, . . . will be to proclaim on the house-tops the Gospel which He gave to the world, and to make very sure that the Kingdom of Heaven shall not be destroyed from within.
>
> 'The Church was right in her long reluctance to use any creeds in her worship: for the peril of every age is to bury the future in the past. Even regret is dangerous. It was Jesus who said, "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God"' (p. 150).

OUR FUTURE CLERGYMEN

By THE EDITOR.

IN the recent session of the Canterbury Convocation, Dr. Woodward, Bishop of Bristol, secured the appointment of a Commission to consider problems concerned with the selection, testing, and training of ordinands. Whilst Dr. Woodward con-

[1] *The Church and the Twentieth Century*. Edited by G. L. H. Harvey. (Macmillan and Co. June, 1936.)

sidered that the training of ordinands is better now than it was formerly, he felt that there was still much room for further improvement, but selection before training needed, in his judgment, much more care. The Church was far from getting the clergy she most needed. No doubt, Dr. Woodward expressed what many feel, but the problem bristles with difficulties. Church authorities can only select from those who come forward: and the Theological Colleges are in a similar situation. They can only admit for training those who apply to enter. Some years ago an influential deputation of M.P.'s and others complained to Archbishop Davidson of the men that the Theological Colleges were producing. The Archbishop replied that the men going out from the Theological Colleges were not all that he could wish, but he added: 'You should see those men when they go in.'

The men offering themselves to-day for ordination are in many cases drawn from a lower social stratum than formerly. We do not wish to be misunderstood on this point. The Ministry has always been, and should always remain, open to men of humble origin, but it is necessary that such men should have real mental, moral and spiritual gifts, and that they should be capable of developing the social graces. Yet the Church is not getting anything like a sufficient proportion of such men from the new stratum which it is mining, and at the same time the proportion of public school men, trained in our ancient Universities and possessed of private means and social influence, shows a very large decline in numbers. This is really very serious for the Church of England. Many of our English parishes cannot be held by clergymen without means: such parishes cannot pay a living wage for professional men, nor maintain a married clergy. Neither will such parishes ever be able to do so. It is practically impossible to increase their incomes. On the other hand, uniting them with neighbouring parishes is a most unpopular proceeding, and one which weakens the Church in rural areas. A celibate clergy could hold such livings, but the laity demand a married clergy, with means, as parochial incumbents. There is no reason why, as in Victorian times, these should not be forthcoming if the clerical life were as attractive to young men as many other underpaid professions. Plainly, it is not so

attractive, and the primary business of the Commission should be to find out why. Clerical incomes are smaller. This is true. Moreover, England is much more materialistic and pleasure-loving than formerly. The ordinary clergyman's life, whether in town or country, and most clergymen must be content to be ordinary clergymen, appears to be a very dull affair and it is certainly poorly paid.

But the trouble lies deeper. The foundations of traditional Christianity are sapped: its dogmas are discredited. Many young men cannot whole-heartedly accept the Christian religion and so cannot feel any interest in maintaining or propagating it. 'There's the rub.' The Church has got to teach the essentials of the Christian religion in a new way: it has frankly to jettison much which is uncouth and archaic. The Church is slowly changing her traditional dogmas — but how slowly! and because she is so slow, and in other cases because she is so reactionary, there is a vast silent desertion from her practising membership of millions of intelligent men and women. They cannot accept the old dogmatic beliefs in their traditional form, and the essential truths of the Christian Religion are not yet presented by the Church in credible and convincing forms. Hence, one of the most important problems in connection with getting the right kind of men for the Church's ministry is the dogmatic problem. It is hard to estimate how many excellent and eminent men the Church might have had in her ministry, if she had purged and simplified and modernized her dogmatic teaching years ago. How many notable men, like Walter Pater and Thomas Hardy, have thought of Holy Orders and then have abandoned the idea on account of dogmatic difficulties. Self-seeking sophists may come forward as ordinands, so may self-satisfied obscurantists, and narrow-minded fanatics, but the rank and file of intelligent, educated men of goodwill, cannot.

Are then only men of these kinds being ordained to-day? Not altogether so. Men of great ability and unimpeachable sincerity are being ordained to-day, but they are men who can distinguish the truth from its forms, and whose sense of proportion and values enables them to separate the essential from the non-essential. We do not mean that all dogmatic difficulties vanish for such, but these men are able to do what the traditional-

ist and the secularist decline to do — regard the apprehension of Christian truth as a spirtual pilgrimage in which dogmas stand forth only as sign-posts or as working hypotheses — things to be proved experimentally, not to be accepted or rejected with literalist finality. Such an attitude towards dogma is not yet openly and courageously encouraged by the Church authorities, although there are notable individual exceptions.

Hence our dogmatic standards must be reformed, and reformed quickly, if we are to draw our ordinands from educated and disinterested circles. If only the Christian Religion could be held to be true and of essential value for mankind, there are still young Englishmen to-day who would, at considerable personal self-sacrifice, come forward as ordinands; but as the Church to-day presents its theology, or seems to present it, they cannot accept it or propagate it. The fundamental difficulty, as we see it, is not financial, but dogmatic.

The Church seems eager to reform its finance, its patronage system, its ceremonial, its relation to the State, everything in short except its dogmatic system. Why?

Some will reply: it is because that dogmatic system is unchangeable by its very nature. It is 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints'; others will reply: it is because the Church fears to reformulate its faith as the result of falsely identifying the dogmatic formula with the underlying truth. This is because the Church has no real faith in the guidance of the Spirit of Truth which can lead it into all truth. There is much new truth: there are new ways of thinking: they have rendered the ancient good uncouth and the Church of England corporately has not yet had the courage and the faith to make the needful adjustment between the old and the new. The ecclesiastical situation is like that described by the Hebrew prophet: 'Children are come to the birth but there is not strength to deliver.'

Ten years have gone by and we are still awaiting the conclusion of the work of the Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission and the practical dogmatic reforms which should follow it; but until then the Church will go on bleeding to death in this period of 'confusion, rebuke and blasphemy.'

There are minor matters to be decided connected with the selection of ordinands and their financial assistance. The Archbishop of Canterbury in the discussion in Convocation is reported in the *Times* (May 30) as saying :

> 'They had made a great mistake in the past in doling out grants to sons of the clergy and other estimable persons instead of concentrating what money there was on their best material and ensuring that that material got the fullest, the longest, and the most adequate training.'

Our own experience, generally speaking, favours the sons of the clergy as ordinands. This personal experience is justified by a study of the Dictionary of National Biography with its long list of eminent Englishmen bred in clerical homes. It is of some interest to note that a mediaeval Archbishop of Canterbury argued in favour of the marriage of the clergy by asserting that it undoubtedly possessed the divine approval 'since the greatest and best part of the English clergy were the sons of priests.' We are of the opinion, other things being equal, that a preference should be given, where financial assistance is needed, to the training of the sons of the clergy, especially when we consider the poverty and self-respecting economy of many clerical homes.

We also are convinced that, other things being equal, a preference should be given, where financial assistance is needed, to graduates. We have known a number of cases where graduates of excellent character who have not drawn a penny from the Church towards the expense of their education have sought financial assistance from the Church authorities to help them to train for the minstry and have been refused on the ground that there were no funds available, while at the same time non-graduates were being assisted out of Church funds. We have known also of a number of candidates for the Ministry who have been financially assisted to graduate and after graduation have discovered that they have lost their sense of vocation and have entered on some other career for which graduation had fitted them. We do not think these men were insincere, but anyone who knows the way in which a domestic pietism can disintegrate under the influence of a University environment will realize how

precarious a financial transaction it is to give grants to very young men to enable them to go up to the University and graduate as a preliminary to ordination. We do not assert that grants should never be given to such young men, and that they must secure assistance only from private beneficence and unofficial Church societies, but we do maintain that only *after* all graduate applicants have received needful financial help, should grants out of Church Assembly and Diocesan Funds be given to non-graduates. We ought to add that the allocations made by the Church Assembly are miserably small and even some of this money is spent on office and secretarial expenses.

Stress was laid in the Convocation debate on 'the testing' of Ordinands. Of course too much attention cannot be given to the personal qualifications and moral characters of those seeking ordination, but an inquisitorial investigation of religious views and dogmatic beliefs of young men seeking ordination ought not to be practised. Yet we have known of such objectionable proceedings. These young men are theologically ignorant and ecclesiastically immature : as they develop not only should their knowledge grow but their views are almost certain to change : testing therefore of this sort is a most detrimental practice and leads either to revolt, hypocrisy or obscurantism.

Study and thoughtfulness should be encouraged, but ordinands should be given to understand that they ought to 'follow the argument whithersoever it leadeth.' Archbishop Frederick Temple's aphorism should be hung in the chamber of the C.A.C.T.M. 'where the conclusions are prescribed the study is precluded.'

With regard to 'official approval' to be given to candidates for the minstry, this is wholly within the power of the bishops and we could wish that the bishops should keep it there. Both the initial interview, as also the concluding interview, should be conducted by the Bishop alone. Interviews by committees, reports of interviews conducted by the secretaries of committees, can be no satisfactory substitute for episcopal action in this most important matter.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND THE INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY*

By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D., F.B.A., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.

UNDER this perhaps inadequate title I propose to comment upon the bearing of Biblical Criticism on certain large questions of historical interest, questions both of ancient history and of the history this age is making. The starting-point is a simple one. To-day we can look back upon the growth of the Old Testament, the complete Bible, the Early Church, Mediaeval Catholicism and the developments during the last four or five centuries. We pass from the Bible to Christian Theology and Philosophy, and to Western Christianity. We should agree that the Bible has had an incalculable influence upon the course of western thought. But with the progress of Biblical Criticism inherited ideas of the Bible have been shaken and are now being reshaped. Hence we may well ask ourselves whether we suppose that the changes will affect the theology and philosophy of the future, and in any way shape the future course of western thought. Biblical Criticism has sometimes been held to be at least partly responsible for modern scepticism, loss of faith and moral decay; although, on the other hand, there are those who know that it has lessened or removed their doubts and difficulties. But this paper will take a wider survey and, confining itself mainly to Old Testament history, it will consider what Biblical Criticism has to suggest. It will be convenient to number the main points I shall endeavour to make.

(1) That the value and authority of religion are directly or indirectly involved in the urgent problems of to-day will scarcely be denied: the current social, political and national difficulties have a moral or spiritual 'aspect'—though some readers would probably prefer to say 'root.' In any case we cannot be indifferent to the question of the future of the Bible. To-day it seems to be possible—as in Communism—to aim at an idealism that is anti-Biblical, if not anti-religious. Also,

* Dr. Cook's second and concluding article will be published in the July *M.C.*—Ed.

there are those who are definitely hostile to the Old Testament, and not solely on 'anti-Semitic' grounds. Again, it seems possible to combine the sincerest recognition of the supreme importance of religion with actions against Jews, or against political opponents, or against an enemy, which are widely felt to be incompatible with civilized ideals. Moreover, the Churches in general, and now the Roman Church in particular, are on trial; nor are they unaware of their own internal fundamental difficulties. Such is the anxiety of men, their distress and their impatience that no one can foretell the outcome. We can only feel sure that, in so far as religious questions are involved, the significance, value and authority of the Bible are at stake. We cannot look for speedy or easy solutions — this is my first point — the present situation in the whole world of thought has grown up irresistibly out of the past, and it behoves us to take a wide, unprejudiced and deliberate view of things in the light of all that will help us to understand our own position.

(2) Meanwhile, Biblical Criticism is impinging upon matters increasingly delicate and controversial. In some quarters, it is true, there is a complacent feeling that it has shot its bolt: have not archaeology and the monuments established the substantial truth and accuracy of the Bible? It is as though all that men needed was to be assured of the accuracy of the Pentateuch and other portions of the Old Testament. The consequence is that there are sincere men actuated by the best of intentions who are, however unwittingly, leading people away from the really important facts of the Bible and concentrating their attention upon relatively secondary matters. But, on the other hand, the comparative, psychological and historical study of religions is emphasizing the profoundly different qualities or grades of religion. In our endeavour to estimate these our present religious standpoints are involved and we are often forced to test and reconsider our deepest personal convictions. Everywhere the blend of good and evil in the world's religions arouses us to the fact that the facile dichotomy of the 'religious' and the 'non-religious' spheres of life and thought is not enough. The differences in religion itself have shaped history, and Biblical Criticism has to face questions immensely more complex and far-reaching than the historicity or credibility of this event or that narrative. The

Old Testament means one thing to a Biblical Criticism that is seeking to *understand* the Book, and another to those who are concerned mainly to defend it or prove its accuracy; for the aim of criticism is to determine the significance of the Bible for world history and religion.

(3) It may be claimed that Biblical Criticism has a specially important place in modern thought. Because the Bible is studied from various 'non-religious' points of view — history, psychology, anthropology, etc. — the principles and methods must be not less objective and penetrating than those in 'secular' research. And because there is something in the Bible that has made it play a unique part in the past, this is a fact to which we must do justice. Similarly the Comparative Study of Religions must combine a perfectly free and unprejudiced attitude to all the world's evidence with a whole-hearted recognition of its impressiveness for men and all that religion has achieved. In both fields of study there must be some reasonable combination of Biblical and non-Biblical lines of research, and of Christian and non-Christian ideas. Accordingly, if there was once a day when all thought was subordinated to the Bible, the present tendencies are towards giving the Bible and Christianity — viewed in the light of modern knowledge — an integral place in the midst of human culture. Such a position must be a natural and a rational one, recognizing the persistence and intensity of men's religious convictions, and co-ordinating, less imperfectly than does the average man, the two diverse hemispheres of our life. The ideal goal is a working harmony between the 'religious' and the 'non-religious' categories, between the 'real' life of practical experience and the not less, but more 'real' experiences of the religious consciousness.

The Bible is our sole authority for some of the profoundest creative movements in man's history. If it does not seem to have the supreme value, so often attached to it in the past, as a living force in history, we should remember that the story of its actual growth is one of ebb and flow, of decay and of fresh life. Biblical Criticism aims at a reasonable synthesis of 'religious' and 'non-religious' thought; and consequently it has a scope which is not possessed by those studies or enquiries whose aim is more restricted. Taking a thoroughly historical survey of the streams

of thought in the past, it cannot treat the present world-situation as other than transitional, and it is therefore obliged to look beyond the present state of culture and the present state of Biblical study.

(4) Biblical scholars are, as such, free and independent 'arm-chair' students under no compulsion to 'close the ranks' against some common foe. Were this unfortunately the case it might of course be possible to draw up a programme, to set up a banner under which all could unite. Thus, it would be very generally agreed that the Pentateuch, the Psalms and the book of Isaiah were not by Moses, David and Isaiah respectively. But behind our agreement there might be very serious differences, and these might hamper our progress, since to emphasize them would only embarrass our 'party' and prejudice our cause.[1] Yet among our opponents we should find much that we could and should readily adopt, were it not that we might seem to 'sell the pass' and play into the hands of the 'enemy.' Hence our unity might at one time further our cause, but at another it might impede the free play of thought among ourselves; what might on one occasion clarify the vital differences between ourselves and our opponents might, on another, sever us from those from whom we might otherwise have much to learn.

Similarly, in the world of affairs an anxiety for 'reunion' against a common 'enemy' can paralyse growth. In religion the enemy will be said to be Unitarianism, or Materialism, or the attack upon Christianity. But however intelligible may be the desire to close the ranks and present a common front, the consequences can be detrimental both to the cause and to the progressive development of thought. A survey of the past will persuade us that the age-long movement of thought is more impressive than the kaleidoscope of shifting scenes and changing 'policies.' Just as Biblical Criticism has at one time gained by intensive-

[1] I refrain from crossing *t's* and dotting *i's*; readers *au courant* with the history of Old Testament criticism may recall the 'dangerous' men: Winckler and Cheyne, to name no more! *Non tali auxilio?* As regards inter-party differences, some would say that such-and-such sources are substantially early, but there are late additions, whereas others would argue that they are substantially late in their present form but contain much that is old. Here the question of the Pentateuch would sever conservatives and traditionalists from the 'critics'; and the question of JE, one may say, would sever 'orthodox' critics from the 'unorthodox' or 'advanced.'

ness and a narrow specialism but at another has suffered, so in the world of affairs the corresponding phases of particularism or nationalism have been powerful factors, now in advancing the march of thought and now in restricting it. Indeed, one of the most impressive results of Biblical Criticism is the picture we are gaining of the manifold phases both in the actual growth of the Bible itself and in the subsequent interpretation and criticism of its contents.

There are processes extending over many centuries which give the Bible a universal and world-historical significance that is not realized when we fasten our eyes upon and estimate the particular circumstances at any one date. The more proportionate our survey of the past the more judicially can we understand the present, and appreciate the difference between a given situation and the inconspicuous factors that are helping to shape the future. Thus, to-day certain relatively weak movements that might well influence subsequent events can be recognized, not only in lands dominated by Fascist, Communist or National-Socialist systems, but also in religion and in Biblical Criticism. Accordingly, the point to be made here is the importance of a historical study of the processes of thought in ancient and modern times, in the light of which we can more competently apply ourselves to the ancient or modern problems under consideration.

(5) To-day the Bible is being set in the field of history and religion: the early chapters of Genesis, the knowledge of the old writers, are being replaced by our own knowledge. The age of Abraham already finds Palestine an integral part of the Ancient Near East; and we have history and religion in the lands of the Old Testament long before we can utilize its contents and place them in our new picture.[2] The age of Moses is, we may say,

[2] The consequences are not yet recognised. Any significant theory based upon or involving the Old Testament must take a wide view of the relevant fields. (*a*) It is precarious to enlarge upon an absolute transition from nomad or pastoral life to settled agricultural conditions forgetful of the chequered ethnical and political fortunes of the land. (*b*) It is no less precarious to trace an orderly (evolutionary) development of literary types (*Formgeschichte*) in such pages of the past as happen to be preserved out of what was once, as we can see, a considerably larger body of literature. Finally, (*c*) neither a history of Old Testament religion nor an Old Testament theology can be safely based upon that Book alone: it simply does not give the material for a proportionate or systematic view.

brilliantly illumined, and our horizon widens as we reach the age of the reconstruction of Israel in the exilic age, *i.e.* in and about the sixth century B.C., and the rise of Christianity some six centuries later. Accordingly, the Old Testament is now placed upon a vaster canvas, and we can more truly apprehend the essential difference between the growth of Biblical religion and the vicissitudes of religion and history elsewhere, even as we best appreciate the distinctiveness of *homo sapiens* or *h. faber* when he is placed among the other primates.

Now, in this wider history Israel's exilic period becomes extraordinarily interesting. Let the reader follow the Old Testament narrative from the last days of the Judaean monarchy, through the Exile, to the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Here he has to find a place for the monotheistic idealism of the Second Isaiah, a teaching so sublime from the Christian standpoint, that we are forced to conclude that it must have some definite historical background. There must have been some distinctive religious movement that paved the way for the reconstruction of Israel and for the centuries that were to be the prelude to the rise of Christianity.[3] The reader will more vividly appreciate that age if he turns to the outside world upon which the history and religion of Israel are to be placed. He can follow the history of the surrounding powers and pass from an old Oriental epoch to that of Persia, Greece and Rome.[4] He can read of the great epoch-making changes in the history of religious and other thought from China to Greece. In this way the Second Isaiah holds a pre-eminent place in a mighty transitional act, and the reader may not unnaturally be tempted to associate Israel's new convictions of Divine Reality and the Greek theories of Reality in the world of space and time.

The story of these events has hardly become familiar to us,[5]

[3] See the article on 'The Evolution of Biblical Religion' in the *Modern Churchman,* xxiv (1934), pp. 471-484.

[4] Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, sixty years ago, spoke of three vast periods, two of which have already passed away: 'they may be called, in general terms, Primaeval History, Classical History and Modern History.' The exilic age divides the first from the second. See *The Jewish Church* (6th ed., 1876), Vol. III, Ch. xlii.

[5] See, for example, T. H. Robinson, *Israel,* i, 13 n.; *Camb. Anc. Hist.,* iii, 489, 499, and the Synchronistic Table. F. Weinrich, *Rel.-utop. Charakter d. prophet. Politik* (Giessen, 1932), p. 8 and n. 6, gives references to German literature (*e.g.* Deussen, *Allgem. Geschichte d. Philosophie,* i, 3, p. 116).

but they undoubtedly enable us to understand anew the Biblical history. Israel's monotheistic impulse comes after the fall of the kingdom and before the inauguration of Post-exilic Judaism. It is at the close of one series of stages and at the beginning of another. From Israel's rediscovery and restatement of the relationship between herself and her God we pass at last to the time when the approach to God is to come, not through Israel and her Torah, but through a Person and a new Israel. Upon two great creative periods turn the Old Testament and the New, and if we are to understand the Bible *historically* we cannot know too much of their background.

But how meagre is the Biblical treatment of the history of the exilic period! What is given to us in Kings, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah is of the slightest, though it is undoubtedly important, from the standpoint of post-exilic Israel. The written history, which is exceedingly intricate,[6] emphasizes the continuity between pre-exilic and post-exilic times, but it utterly obscures, or rather, it ignores the part played by the great reforming prophets and the Second Isaiah. It depicts the reintroduction and the re-establishment of a Mosaism of many centuries earlier — of the far-off Amarna Age, now so well known to us — and it has been left for modern criticism to go behind the imperfect record and recover a far more inspiring story — a truer story — of what was surely the most vital factor in the reconstruction of Israel.

For better or for worse Israel forgot the secret of her spiritual progress. Post-exilic Judaism was instituted, and it served its purpose; Israel's new ideology preserved her — until the rise of Christianity. So it was that a religion, a history and an ideology which distinguished the Jews from all other peoples of the earth and gave Israel a pre-eminence in world history, carried her through the centuries until another irresistible movement left her behind, depriving her of her old creative and impregnating power. A written history, an interpretation of history, may serve as a stimulus and an inspiration; but Israel became the victim of a tradition so inadequate and imperfect as to be misleading. Christianity was the fruit of the next regenerative movement, and the Christian very naturally recalls

[6] On this see A. C. Welch, *Post-exilic Judaism* (1935).

the Second Isaiah and the Servant of the Lord. But it is not enough to think of these as an anticipation, a foreshadowing; rather have we two distinct events of the sixth century B.C. and of the first century A.D., the second of which had tragic consequences for the old Israel.

Christian Biblical Criticism is finding beneath or behind the Bible events the more inspiring, indeed, the more sobering, the more historically they are examined. Our better knowledge is warning us that our own conceptions of Biblical history may in turn be so imperfect as to be misleading. What we know of Israel of the exilic age and of the 'Israel' of the rise of Christianity brings us to a new stage in our own history which affects the future outlook of both Christianity and Judaism. Hence, for the fifth point, I cannot do better than quote the striking words of Dean Stanley: 'Whatever is true History teaches true Religion, and every attempt to reproduce the ages which immediately preceded or which accompanied the advent of Christianity, is a contribution, however humble, to the understanding of Christianity itself.'[7] True history makes for true religion and true theology.

(6) Next let us glance for a moment at the Maccabaean age. As we read of the brave struggles of Israel, her repudiation of Hellenism and her fight to preserve her national religious genius, we must surely realize that had she failed, had she lost all that gave her her distinctiveness, there would have been no Judaism, no Christianity. To us it is clear that the Jews, however unconsciously, were fighting the world's battles.[8] Of course there is plenty to be said against Antiochus Epiphanes; but, after all, his policy 'had a sane purpose.'[9] Yet Israel's rebellion was justified, even though she stood for rites that to some might seem unimportant. However, the years pass, and we experience a certain feeling of disappointment. It is only too easy to comment upon the narrowness of her religion and the worldliness and ruthlessness of her internal politics.[10] But this is not

[7] *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. xxii.

[8] Edwyn Bevan, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, viii, 514: 'of all that was happening in the kingdom of Antiochus, the events of Judaea were by far the most important in their consequences for the mind of man in ages to come.'

[9] *Op. cit.*, p. 499.

[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 533. *Cf.* also Oesterley, *Israel*, ii, 281 et seq.

without analogy: the Second Isaiah had stirred a dispirited Israel by the tidings that she had a part to play in God's world; but later, a by no means pleasing particularism renounced alliance with the non-Israelites. Nor can we ignore the contrast between the fine conception of the Servant of the Lord and the later gloating of the 'servants' over the faithless (*Is.* lxv, 13 et seq.).

We must take no narrow or one-sided view of the stream of events in Israel's history. The stubborn and fiery spirit that upheld her in the Maccabaean age had its unpleasant side, and the sturdy confidence in her own Yahweh which sustained her in her fight against 'apostates,' also made her disown the sect that became Christianity. The history of peoples, like that of men, has its lights and shades; indifference and enthusiasm; tragic mistakes and glorious heroism; despair, confidence — and then, over-confidence. A movement starts with enthusiasm or fanaticism — and ends in necessary compromise, opportunism, and what looks like hypocrisy. Of such stuff is history made; and any excessive laudation of Ancient Israel is as misleading — and unfair to the Jew of to-day — as a determination to see only the faults and errors. It takes a valet to 'debunk' a hero, whereas by patience and sympathy we can see, from within, the achievements of men of the past who, confronted by the difficulties of their own age, were scarcely less honest than their judges of to-day. And thereby can we see more wisely, albeit more humbly, what lies before us in an age which in its turn may be called upon to be true to itself, if not rather to become conscious of that to which it is called upon to be true.

Men and nations can have the defects of their qualities; it is no less true of religious and other systems of thought. We read our Old Testament history, we can pass from the Exilic Age to the rise of Christianity, we can survey the wide diversity of thought and action — and the more candidly we can understand the heights and depths that perpetually confront us in the lives of men and nations, the more insistent is the problem of *Das Geschehen* and *Geschichte*, the difference between successive happenings and what makes great history.

(To be concluded.)

MODERNISM AS A TEMPER AND AS A PARTY

By the Rev. M. T. Dunlop, M.A., Vicar of West Hendred and Senior Tutor of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

THE question, What of the future of Modernism as a movement in the Church of England? is commonly met to-day by another, Has Modernism any future at all? Most of the answers are in the negative, or hesitant. Even friendly observers do not all of them give unqualified replies. There are Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics who dismiss the question with the assertion, not always complacently uttered, 'We are all Modernists to-day.' It is a contemporary achievement of the Church of England that in a sense this is partly true. The Anglican Church has made her own a great part of modern thought and knowledge. The majority of the leading Modernists themselves express this truth when they maintain that Modernism is not the property of a Church Party, but is a spirit and temper which may and does permeate ever more deeply the English Church as a whole. It is the spirit and temper of liberty, tolerance and service of truth, in which mood alone the Christian religion may be truly held and followed. What, then, is the point of a Modernist organization, and does not the future lie with this spirit and temper rather than with the Modernist Party? The younger men and women now persistently ask this question, uneasily if they happen already to belong to the Party, impatiently if they do not and a Modernist missionary approach them.

The Modernist Party, it is said these days, has secured its objective: liberty for Biblical study and the publication of results by sermon and book. Not only do the other Parties now co-operate but, it is true, some of their scholars are in advance of Modernists, particularly in New Testament studies. Again, the two great other parties have each a distinctive theology, a Church-theory, a distinctive piety and devotion, and man needs

more than Biblical study, if some need that at all. The fact is that Modernists of the past twenty-five years have been men nurtured as Evangelicals or Anglo-Catholics: thanks to the Modernist Party and its defensive organization they have found liberty for their religious studies within the Church of England, but their religious roots, emotional, ritualistic, instinctive, have gone down to earth elsewhere. To-day young men and women, uprooted, seek earth: intellectual liberty within the Church, such is their impression, may be taken for granted, and they are turning to one or the other of the two great parties, but still tentatively, for the rumble of battles long ago has not altogether faded. There are other interests, so their argument goes, than the academic, in which field Modernism has hitherto chiefly flourished. This age has need of sound Christian political and economic theory, and of social righteousness; the habit of war threatens the whole organism of civilization; the English Church is in dire need of financial and administrative reconstruction; new forms of worship are urgently required. A young Modernist, or an old, who hears the trumpet summoning to any of these assays may well shake himself free of his P's and Q's, his analysis of Miracle, his piecing together of Patristic meaning, and ask of his soul with sudden sense of release, '*Que diable allait-il faire dans cette galère?*'

II.

But for the fact that for many Modernists of this generation neither Evangelicalism nor Anglo-Catholicism holds much attraction and cannot offer earth for our roots, we could almost wish that such a view of the position were true. Closer consideration of the present Church of England proves the view sadly out of focus. It is happily true that there is, more than ever before, a spirit of tolerance and understanding as between men of opposite parties, in clerical meetings, on Diocesan Boards, and in a dozen other spheres. This Christian fellowship is more important than any of the programmes for which the parties stand, but if it is to remain healthy it is essential that each member shall be clear about his own principles, and loyal to them, no matter how sharply these may distinguish him from his fellows.

Let it be readily and humbly admitted by the Modernist that

the Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic are Christian men, committed for life to that view of God and man of which the New Testament, taken as a whole, is the regulative norm. It remains that sincere men may differ and err in their interpretation and practice of the New Testament revelation. The Modernist interpretation is governed by his acceptance of history as being of the real, by his faithful use of the historical method and by a self-commitment to reason which is absolute. For the Modernist, life is more than reason may analyse or articulate, but it is never contrary to reason. For him the supra-rational and mysterious is only to be negatively defined by men — however it may be poetically adumbrated — in the conduct of man's proper business as a thinker, namely, to pursue reason as far as it will take him. The Modernist must stand by what he considers to be reasonable whatever the theological or ecclesiastical consequences, and despite the general admission that he may be in error and come to change his view. For him it is legitimate to use the historical method throughout the field in which revelation has occurred, in the Bible or outside it; and reasoning from what of revelation is thus discovered to him, he forms his theology and shapes his Church-theory. Thus tradition, however venerable, the Dogma and Order of the Past, the New Testament itself, provide not patterns but data for the Modernist, from which, in the light of his own personal Christian experience, he seeks to formulate the Christian Faith for his own day. He seeks formulation, first, to clarify and strengthen his own faith; next, that he may preach it to all the world.

Faithfulness first to history and to reason, these are the distinguishing marks of Modernism, and the situation is such that they make of Modernism not only a spirit but an independent Party in the Church of England to-day. There is space here to justify this assertion by a brief survey of Anglo-Catholicism only. This is chosen for contrast rather than Evangelicalism because the Church of England to-day for its greater part may be termed Anglo-Catholic in its theology and Church-theory. So it appears to an outsider such as Adolf Keller. Anglo-Catholicsm, in its milder forms, provides a working creed, taken very much for granted, for the busy administrator, the average Rural Dean or Archdeacon, the home officials of the Missionary

Societies: men who deal warily with Modernism and look askance at Ripon Hall.

The Anglo-Catholic is still defending the Tractarian position, though on new fronts, and successfully, if the present verdict of the English Church be final. The inspiration of the movement was and is an ardent Christocentric piety lending radiance to certain conceptions which, however, are not inevitable to that type of piety. Chief among these conceptions distinguishing the Anglo-Catholic Party, is that of the Eucharist as a Divinely instituted channel of Grace which may not be perfectly apprehended in any other way; and that of the Church, in which alone this Eucharist may be had, as a Divine society, Divinely ordered, with Divinely-given privileges of knowledge and authority. The foundation of this structure is the classical dogma concerning Jesus Christ viewed as an irruption into history, in His Being omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent. This position as originally held was heavily assaulted in the last century by the forces of science, of history and Biblical criticism, and soon became untenable. In the last ditch Liddon, in his Bampton Lectures, put up a brilliant performance, wielding the weapon of the *communicatio idiomatum* almost desperately, but to no purpose. The situation was saved by Bishop Gore, and his friends and followers, by means of a new statement of the doctrine of *Kenosis*. This has become the Christological doctrine characteristic of present-day Anglicanism, and it is important to observe the precise use the Anglo-Catholic makes of it. He claims for this doctrine the most ancient antecedents, but there is the profoundest difference between the classical and modern forms of it. Apollinarius, Cyril of Alexandria and Liddon himself postulate by this doctrine, or in their adumbration of it, a process of divine self-emptying, not pre-mundane, in order to allow to the Divine Being of the incarnate Christ, by virtue of His condescension, the full experience of Manhood in its weakness and limitation. Such writers as Gore and Mackintosh by this same doctrine preserve for Christ those divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence of which the New Testament, critically understood, offers no evidence. The doctrine is for them, strictly speaking, rather a Heavenly Retention of these attributes, and not a self-emptying on earth. The Christ is all that

Catholic Tradition claims Him to be, but, in so far, and just in so far, as history denies this, not so the Christ Incarnate. It is thus possible for Gore and his school, and, it has proved, for Anglicanism at large, to retain the classical dogma of Christ in all its rigour, and with it the sacramental and ecclesiastical superstructure whose preservation is their real purpose, while yet also acknowledging, when they must, the findings of the historian, the scientist and the critic concerning the limitations and ignorance of the historic Jesus. The device was skilful and soon used again. Part of the Tractarian superstructure was a theory of redemption demanding a view of world-history as a drama begun with the Fall of Adam, with the Cross as climax. History brought new perspectives in which the backcloth disappeared, but more seriously for apologetic purposes, science could not find Adam. Dr. N. P. Williams has attempted to restore confidence in this part of the structure by postulating a pre-mundane Fall. There would not seem to be any limit to the accommodation Heaven might provide for beliefs which can no longer exist on earth.

III.

The Anglican doctrine of the *Kenosis*, though philosophically disreputable, is politically most expedient. On the one hand the traditional Christ, the unique Eucharist, the divine Church and its priesthood; on the other, and separately, acknowledgment of history and science: the arrangement has worked as far as the Church is concerned. From pulpit to pulpit, from book to book, modern learning can be allowed for according to the sympathies of the priest and the needs of his people, while yet full Catholic teaching is maintained. Anglo-Catholicism has become almost as adaptable as Roman Catholicism to the varying intelligences of the Faithful. The essence of the situation is the clerical defence of a position irrational and unhistorical by means of admitting, but always in detail only, as much of the findings of reason and history as the laity insist upon. The method has saved the face of the clergy before their flocks, and lost England. Of England indeed these clergy now despair: she must be regarded as lost at least temporarily, and Divine church divorced from secular nation. The clerics are but seeking to

declare absolute a decree *nisi* pronounced by themselves fifty years ago.

In the Anglo-Catholic intellectual world this eating of the dogmatic cake at the behest of history and reason, and the having it at the behest of experience and ecclesiastical expediency has produced extraordinary anomalies. There is a great gulf, not to be confused with difference in degree of understanding, between the Anglo-Catholic scholar and the rank-and-file, on all questions of reason and history, a gulf not to be found in the Modernist Party. Nor does Anglo-Catholic scholarship influence or check the Party's ecclesiastical policy, say over ritualistic practices or Reunion. In these matters their scholarship has little influence upon the scholars themselves. Those men who signed the Manifesto warning Anglo-Catholic priests against acceptance of work in the Reunited Church of South India, on the grounds that that Church departs from Catholic order, are all of them men who, as historians, can hardly disagree in essentials with the Bishop of Gloucester's recent account of the origins of the Christian Ministry, nor, one would think, with the balanced and cautious conclusions the Bishop drew therefrom for modern guidance. Incidentally, this matter of Order is becoming one of comparative importance, ever since the Lambeth Conference gave it prominence. In many fields the Anglo-Catholic to-day is attempting in the name of a mystic Order to recover positions, dogmatic and ecclesiastical, from which history and reason dislodged him long ago. The Catholic Modernists in effect admit as much, and gaily discard history. Or again, the little Handbook on the Bible produced by the Modern Churchmen's Union was attacked in the *Church Times* by writers who must know that the Handbook was conservative when compared to many recent and expensive publications by Anglo-Catholics. What is the answer to the riddle? The writer last year heard an eminent and lovable Anglo-Catholic theologian devoutly hope that New Testament criticism would never be popularized. In his opinion the effect upon the ordinary man for the Old Testament had been disastrous. The answer lies there. The Anglo-Catholic is sincerely and primarily concerned for the welfare of his flock as he conceives it; that is, he is concerned for the preservation of his

Divine society, its Eucharistic worship and its Order. He is compelled to admit, for himself, the force of history and reason, but as a priest he is not primarily concerned with history and reason; he is not devoted to them and will in fact circumvent them if necessary, by the road of Order or some other way, for the sake of his Divine Church. But the Modernist can no more help himself broadcasting New Testament criticism, as occasion serves, than that particular Anglo-Catholic theologian could bring himself to do it; and both are moved by the same overwhelming power, their religion. The Modernist, though equally concerned with the preaching and missionary task, and though well aware that the whole truth cannot, for the sake of truth, be announced in the first moment from the pulpit, is devoted to history and to reason and believes, as an article of faith dependent on his view of God and man, that no faith can ever win souls in any real sense which is incompatible at any point with either reason or history. What is unreasonable and unhistorical must be destroyed or changed even although a number of people imagine that their souls live by it. That is why Modernism is distinct as a Party, as a Faith, and is not merely a spirit permeating the other Parties. Modernism stands by virtue of its religion in opposition to contemporary Anglicanism and its religion, and compromise is impossible for both. So far as the Evangelical is primarily attached to his soteriological and Biblical dogmas, he stands also in opposition to Modernism. Modernism has still to convert the Church of England. So great a task is not beyond the power of Modernists of this generation, if they approach it in no superior spirit but with the intent to renew their own spiritual and intellectual lives, and with a warm but clear understanding of the positions and opinions of their fellow-Churchmen.

IV.

Contemporary Anglicanism, both Catholic and Evangelical, has been compelled to adjust and modify itself against the forces of history and science. The clergy have unobtrusively set back Canute's chair, and each has drawn a line to the tide, 'Thus far and no further.' Not all drew their line where Bishop Gore did, but wherever drawn, the lines have been successively obliterated. The Modernists have been part of the tide. In relation to the

new learning they were not defenders of the ecclesiastical position it threatened and which it has since overwhelmed: they were students imbued with the new spirit and were themselves in attack. It is this apparently Edomitish action which their hard-pressed ecclesiastical brethren have found unforgiveable. This is the key to the political situation in the English Church, and accounts for the curious and often irritating anomaly, that whereas Modernist scholarship and its findings are now very generally received, if little be done about them in practice, yet Modernists are suspect or their existence regretted. '*It must needs be that offences come but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh.*'

It would be lacking in candour to deny that Modernist studies during the last thirty years have been determined by certain limitations and presuppositions. There was not much time nor energy for dogmatics and Church-theory when so much was to do in the history of dogma and of the Church. But the ground has been well cleared for construction. Modernists took over, into their Biblical and ecclesiastical studies, perhaps too readily the evolutionary concept from the biological field, and from physical science a theory of natural law in fact outmoded twenty-five years ago. In their social theory the first generation were mostly individualist liberals. But these are the limitations and presuppositions, some sort of which are inevitable to men and their thought. These were not axes to grind.

In particular it is time to protest against the prevalent opinion, taken for granted and too easily asserted in many quarters, that early Modernism, whatever its social theory, has been self-interested in its social practice. It is said that Modernists have been hitherto *bourgeoisie*, acquisitive or apprehensively self-protective in their attitude to social and economic movements. Liberal Protestantism is mocked at as the religious *apologia* of the rentier-class. It is worth recalling that English Modernism rejected the label 'Liberal Christianity' for the very fear of being popularly associated with one particular political party. True, English society being constructed as it is, Modernist clergymen have necessarily been drawn until now largely from the middle-class. But it is too readily assumed that a stigma thereby attaches to them. Few will deny that that

class has been chiefly responsible for the social and economic revolution which has taken place in England during the last fifty years. For example, it is the middle-class which has created modern Socialism and still provides the greater part of the brains of the movement. It has been a revolution by no means to the advantage of the middle-class, and its responsible members have understood as much from the beginning. It is broadly true to say that in their social crusade the middle-class, in the logic of its own liberalism, has virtually sought to destroy itself. Modernists have led the way in many fields, and we shall name only three, Barnett founding the University Settlements, Canney organizing holidays for slum-children, and Dean Rashdall becoming President of the Christian Social Union. Let it be admitted that the social theory which inspired such men may not be apt for the new conditions they themselves have created; nevertheless it was a magnificently Christian theory for its day, the Stewardship of Wealth, and the only theory practicable from the break-up of the Mediaeval polity until now.

Only a shallow understanding of man and history, a petulance of mind, will condemn men of the past because their theories, social, epistemological or religious, can no longer serve us, though evidently effective for them. Theories which we can now discard have formed the scaffolding of early Modernism, now out-builded. To declare Modernism dead because the first scaffolding is gone is to betray as bad a confusion of thought as to declare science and history useless because their premisses, methods and findings show development or change. The erection of the new scaffolding is admittedly a necessary and delicate task.

V.

The intellectual liberty enjoyed in the Church of England to-day has been won by the sacrifice and courage of the past generation of Modernists. The younger Modernist might well read with profit Dr. Major's *English Modernism* or the bare record in C. W. Emmet's *Conscience, Creeds, and Critics*. If he seeks heroic example, sound learning and sound religion in harmony with the English spirit, he need look no further than the origins of his own Party. Nor can he take his present liberty

for granted. Remembering the circumstances of its achievement it is plain what the preservation of liberty will be costing until the face of the Church of England be changed. For reasons of defence alone, the Modernists require to maintain and strengthen their Party organization.

The findings of Modernist scholarship are acknowledged by the Church, but each finding separately; their general bearing is ignored and the Church shows little sign of acting upon the conclusions and proceeding to change her public forms of belief and worship, and her organization. What signs there are come from the Lambeth Conferences. The Revised Prayer-Book Measure was modified Tractarianism over again. Reunion has been so long deferred on grounds of Order that the question is now embarrassing in interdenominational groups. Professor J. M. Creed has shown how far from the Modernist ideal was the Majority Report on the Marriage Laws. No reasonable view of the Church and her Faith can justify the exclusion of modern Unitarians from Anglican pulpits. The Report on Church and State is regarded in authoritative circles as either an alternative or as a prelude to Disestablishment; and while Disestablishment is sought in the name of the spiritual liberty of the Church, and while we may believe in the sincerity of those who advocate it, history will surely record it as the attempt of timid shepherds to withdraw their dwindling remnant from the further devastating impact of modernity upon their traditional worship, morals and beliefs. These decisions and tendencies Modernists must resist, and for the purpose Party organization is necessary.

The Modernist seeks for a new expression of Christian theology, which the Church is to make publicly her own, which shall be compatible with history and reason and not contradictory of science. He seeks forms of worship, which are to be official, consistent with that theology and infused with the modern temper, as radically new, yet old, for this age as the Prayer Book was for its age. He demands a Church Order and discipline which, instead of a barrier, shall prove a bond between at least all Christian Englishmen, yet allowing for their wide diversities of temperament and taste. He desires that the Church may give her authority to a truly Christian morality apt for modern men and their circumstances. By prayer and thought and daily life he will build

up a piety, already emerging, far from widespread in the Church of England to-day, but not alien to the English genius and not far, it may well prove, from the piety which informs the pages of the New Testament and which animated the English Reformers. The Modernist who imagines that these great and distant goals may be reached by merely permeating with his spirit other Church Parties moving in a clean contrary direction, deceives himself and bewilders the layman. Co-operation with others will always be sought, for there are a thousand Modernists going under another name and thousands under none. Frank discussion with men of other views is essential, so manifold is Christian truth. Friendship and Christian tolerance will be natural and yet must not be mistaken for agreement. But to succeed, Modernism needs numbers and Party organization. It is a peculiarly difficult demand, for Modernism has to eschew dragooning and the more effective forms of propaganda which appeal first to the emotions and employ mass-suggestion. There is required the creation, by preaching, teaching and example, of a great concourse of lay men and women each moving freely and clear-sightedly in the one direction which they have deliberately chosen, with clergy worthy to lead by their moral and intellectual authority.

It is said that Modernism has secured its objective. Modernism has but taken the first and perhaps the most difficult step. There is in a real measure a new understanding of the Bible, of history, and of the physical world. There is tacit agreement upon the essentials throughout the Church of England. That understanding with its far-reaching practical consequences has still to be worked out and applied throughout the length and breadth of the ecclesiastical field. And already many sober Englishmen consider we have left it too late, and that the Church cannot now be saved by reform. Modernism has hardly any past, is but establishing itself as an independent Party in the present; it has the future. What of a past Modernists possess has richly endowed them. With the special liberty of Biblical study has come in its train a wide measure of general liberty to preach and teach, to plan and to worship. In that liberty which the Modernist has won for himself, he is now free to advance, and with some confidence, upon the formidable tasks ahead.

ECCLESIASTICAL LAWLESSNESS AND THE RESTORATION OF DISCIPLINE*

By the Rev. J. F. Clayton, M.A., Reader at the Temple Church.

LAWLESSNESS in a clergyman of the Church of England may be defined as failure to obey the rules imposed on him as a minister of that Church. This article is concerned only with lawlessness in regard to the conduct of public worship. The law of public worship is the Prayer-book of 1662, modified only by the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, 1872, and the revised lectionary of 1922. Any deviation from these rules is therefore to be termed 'Lawlessness.'

1. What is the Cause of such Lawlessness?

The situation is not altogether new; for between the Reformation settlement of 1559 and the confirmation of that settlement in 1662 there were many 'non-conformists' within the Church of England who disobeyed the rules prescribed by the Prayer-book; and, except for a few years at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and later on in the time of Archbishop Laud, little seems to have been done to suppress them.

The Act of Uniformity, 1662, forced those who had hitherto been non-conformists within the Church of England either to conform to its rules or to set up dissenting churches outside; and those who chose the former alternative seem to have conformed to the general provisions of the Prayer-book, though some of its rules seem to have been almost universally set aside.

The Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century did not lead to any ritual controversy; and if we could go back to about 1830 we should probably find that the old High-church and Low-church parties, the newer Evangelicals, and the few surviving Latitudinarians all worshipped alike in a fashion that would now be disliked as long, dull and tedious.

Since 1830 the conduct of worship has been affected by changes in religious thought, social habits, and aesthetic taste; and to-day there are few churches, if any, where the service is

* This article is the substance of a paper read to a meeting of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement at Oxford on May 19, 1936.

conducted according to the strict ruling of the 1662 Prayer-book. Thus in many a church which would not wish to be reproached as 'lawless' there are a number of breaches of the law on every Sunday when the Communion is administered at the morning service, *e.g.* the shortening of the opening exhortation, the omission of the Apostles' Creed and versicles after the Jubilate, the substitution of the Gospel Commandments for the Decalogue, the omission of the redundant prayer for the Sovereign before the collect of the day, the omission of exhortations connected with the Communion Service, and perhaps the abbreviation of the words of administration. This almost universal lawlessness is traceable to three causes:

(*a*) Much of it is due to 'convenience.' Most churchgoers are restive if the service exceeds an hour and a quarter, and they desire more music than was customary a century ago; hence some abbreviation is necessary on the score of time. Again, the much more frequent administration of the Sacrament makes it difficult, if not impossible, to read at every Communion all the exhortation provided by the Prayer-book; and when the communicants are many some abbreviation of the formula is necessary unless both minister and laity are to be wearied.

(*b*) Some of the lawlessness is due to the fact that the words of certain parts of the liturgy cannot be used without a sense of insincerity; *e.g.* the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, certain of the occasional prayers such as that for fair weather, and perhaps also the Proper Preface for Whit-Sunday.

(*c*) In one section of the Established Church divergences from the Prayer-book are due to the movement now known as Anglo-Catholic, but such 'lawlessness' demands careful examination. Some forty years ago advanced High Churchmen were content with what were known as the 'six points' of ritual (eastward position; mixed chalice; lights; wafers; vestments; and, among the more extreme, incense). They contended that these practices were legal and that the vestments were ordered by the Ornaments Rubric of 1559. The Privy Council on several occasions decided otherwise, but in 1890 Archbishop Benson, in the Lincoln judgment, ruled that the eastward position, mixed chalice, and lights are permissible, a judgment that was upheld

by the Privy Council in 1892. In 1899 and 1900 Archbishop Temple with the Archbishop of York gave 'opinions' against incense and 'reservation,' but did not claim for these opinions the force of a judicial decision.

In 1906 a Royal Commission reported that lawlessness was very common, and distinguished between that which was 'significant' and that which was 'non-significant.' It recommended such a revision of the Prayer-book as would make the non-significant violations become legal and would also bring within the scope of things legal some of the 'significant' practices, such as the use of vestments. It also scheduled ten illegal practices as plainly repugnant to the doctrines of the Church of England, which 'should promptly be made to cease by the exercise of the authority of the Bishops, and if necessary by proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts.' The perusal of this report of 1906 makes a clergyman of to-day feel that he belongs to a different world. The practices which were 'promptly to be made to cease' are now rampant in many more churches than in 1906; five of the six points for which High Churchmen contended are now common in churches where the doctrine savours of Protestantism; and the ritual allowed by the Lincoln judgment is now practised in many churches still claiming to be Evangelical.

The result of this investigation into the causes of lawlessness can be thus summarized: Lawlessness began because, in the words of the Commission of 1906, 'the Law of Public Worship is too narrow'; it continues because neither the methods proposed by that Commission for the restoration of discipline, nor any other methods, have been carried into effect.

2. The Restoration of Discipline.

Under this heading there are five questions for consideration.

A. *Objections to the Existing Church Courts.*

These courts are: The Consistory Court of each diocese, concerned with faculties and with moral charges but not with the questions now under review; the Provincial Courts, namely the Court of Arches for Canterbury and the Chancery Court for York, presided over respectively by the Dean of Arches and the Official Principal (the two offices are usually held by the same lay judge); the Court of Appeal.

In 1534 Henry VIII prohibited appeals to Rome, and from then until 1832 the appellate jurisdiction of the Crown in ecclesiastical cases was vested in the Court of Delegates. In 1832, with the approval of the Primate and other leading Churchmen, this was transferred to the Privy Council, and in 1833 to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Among the cases brought before the Judicial Committee the following are noteworthy. In 1850 it protected the Rev. C. Gorham against the Bishop of Exeter by pronouncing legal the view on Baptism commonly held by the Evangelicals. In 1864, in the *Essays and Reviews* case, it held that the formulae of the Church of England do not require a clergyman to believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, any particular theory of Christ's Atonement, or the hope of eternal punishment. To-day the more liberal members of all parties are protected by this judgment. In 1872 it held in the Bennett case that a belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Communion is allowable so long as it stops short of Transubstantiation.

Doctrinally the Judicial Committee has therefore protected each party in turn and so saved the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. On matters of ritual between 1857 and 1890 it gave several decisions prohibiting practices that were then confined to advanced High Churchmen; but in 1892 it accepted most of the ruling of Archbishop Benson in the Lincoln judgment of 1890.

Objection is taken to this Court by High Churchmen on the ground that it is not 'spiritual,' partly because Convocation was in abeyance in 1832; but the objection seems open to criticism on several grounds:

(*a*) Many churchmen would demur to the contention that judges in ecclesiastical cases are 'secular' if appointed by the Crown but 'spiritual' if appointed by the clergy.

(*b*) A member of any church, established or otherwise, has the right to appeal to the King's courts if he has been treated unjustly by the church to which he belongs. In such cases the church is the defendant, and is therefore not competent to be also the judge or to provide the judges.

(*c*) The record of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is such that many churchpeople would be loth to sub-

stitute an ecclesiastical tribunal in place of a court of judges skilled in the sifting of evidence and the interpretation of law.

Owing to the disrespect for the Privy Council felt by many of the clergy, a Commission on the Ecclesiastical Courts in 1883 recommended that in such cases the Judicial Committee should consult a body of expert ecclesiastics, but the recommendation was not carried out. The Commission of 1935 recommend a new Court of Appeal consisting partly of laymen who have held high judicial office and partly of judges appointed by the Archbishops. While this proposal is less objectionable than a merely 'spiritual' court, many churchpeople would still prefer the Judicial Committee, even though for the sake of peace they may reluctantly agree to the proposal of the 1935 Commission.

B. *Would the 'Pastoral Tribunals' proposed by the* 1935 *Commission restore discipline? Would they be better than Synodical action?*

Most clergy would obey the bishop even without a 'pastoral tribunal'; the recalcitrant minority would probably defy the pastoral tribunal as they defy episcopal authority so far as it is exercised now. The 'Synod' gives to those bishops who believe in this method an opportunity of submitting the question of censure to the diocesan clergy; but what is the result even when the synod concurs in the censure?

The difficulty seems to arise over the punishment of the recalcitrant clergyman. At present the penalty is imprisonment for contempt of court, a punishment which for non-criminal offences shocks the public conscience. Possibly if suspension followed by deprivation could be substituted, discipline would be less difficult; yet even then some bishops would probably refuse to deprive a clergyman who is lawless in his ministry but loved by those to whom he ministers; and if the popular lawbreaker is not molested, disciplinary measures are hard to justify merely because the lawbreaker happens to be unpopular. This difficulty would not be solved by any legislation.

C. *The meaning of 'Lawful Authority.'*

The Declaration of Assent taken by all clergy binds them to use 'the form in the said book prescribed and none other except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.'

Probably most clergy and laity would agree that 'lawful authority' means the bishop, but some would object to this interpretation. Thus some argue that no bishop has any right to dispense with any rule of the Prayer-book except so far as it is amended by subsequent Acts of Parliament.

Others claim that the provinces of Canterbury and York belong to the 'Western Church,' and that the rules of the 'Western Church' must be obeyed even when they are not endorsed by the Prayer-book. To most English churchmen it is intolerable that the laws of the Western Church should override the laws made by the independent national Church of England; and there is a well-justified suspicion of any attempt to curtail the liberties allowed by the Prayer-book as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It is rare that a bishop supports such repressive measures on the ground of the authority of the Western Church, though very occasionally a High-church bishop has tried to stop the legal and, in many places, very beneficial practice of evening Communion. But as yet the average clergyman and layman would trust the average bishop not to subvert the comprehensive character of the Established Church as maintained by successive decisions of the Privy Council.

D. *The proposed Synodical Declaration* (pp. 87-88 of the Report of the 1935 Commission).

This is to the effect that in the meanwhile no deviation from the Prayer-book is to be allowed unless it is approved by Convocation, sanctioned by the bishop in accordance with the principles laid down by Convocation and approved by the Church Assembly, and also has the goodwill of the particular congregation. To this it may be objected that the deviations would probably be those of the 1928 Prayer-book, and, if so, the synodical declaration would fail to please both clergy, laity and Parliament to the same extent as that rejected book.

An alternative is proposed by the Bishop of Norwich in his recent book on *Church and State* (p. 61). He suggests that an agreed measure of revision might yet be submitted to Parliament; it would avoid those controversial changes in the Communion Service which caused the rejection of the 1928 book,

but would legalize a number of deviations from the 1662 book which are already in constant use; and, he adds, 'who knows but that the genial atmosphere of such agreement might in the end in certain respects thaw some of our real and substantial disagreements?' The Bishop's proposal is at least worthy of consideration.

E. *Would a new Revision of the Prayer-book solve the difficulty?*

I submit that it would, subject only to this one condition, namely, that the revision satisfied *all* parties within the Church of England and was not only a concession to Anglo-Catholicism. If such a book were submitted to Parliament, I venture to think that Parliament would accept a book so plainly desired by all sections of the national Church. But who that knows the Church of England to-day could hope for such a revision?

The answers given to these five questions relative to the restoration of discipline may seem either vague or pessimistic; but it is well to face facts, and it is at least arguable that it is wiser to maintain a *status quo* which is unsatisfactory than to rush into reforms which would make the last state worse than the present.

Two facts seem to me to emerge from the rejection of the 1928 Prayer-book, and the subsequent acquiescence in that rejection by a very large number of churchpeople:

1. A large body of English churchmen do not want such concessions to Anglo-Catholicism as are indicated by 'perpetual reservation.' Had this permission been dropped the book would probably (perhaps certainly) have been allowed by the House of Commons. Whether the concession of such a practice would lead to a quiet desertion of the Church of England by many members of the Evangelical and Liberal laity is another question.

2. A section of Anglo-Catholics will oppose any revision that does not allow perpetual reservation.

Hence a revision such as the majority of English churchmen would accept would probably mean the secession of at least a section of the Anglo-Catholics; the majority of bishops, clergy and laity shrink from the prospect of disruption. The result is an *impasse* from which at present there seems to be no exit.

WHAT IS MAN?*

By the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D.,
Dean of St. Paul's.

'What is man, that thou art mindful of him?'—Ps. viii, 4.

IT needs not any argument that the world, and with it Christianity, is in the midst of a great moral and intellectual crisis. It is the fact that there *is* a crisis which is the justification for the existence of our Society, the Modern Churchmen's Union. It is, however, not so easy as one might have anticipated to say wherein exactly the crisis of our modern days consists. I want to suggest to you this evening that we sum it up perhaps best when we ask in the words of the Psalmist: What is man? What kind of being is humanity? For there seems to be a clash, a contradiction, between what Christianity has supposed Man to be and what modern science in its progress has seemed to disclose his nature as being. I need not outline the traditional Christian conception of Man and his place in the universe: it is familiar to us all. We remember how our religion inherited without question the old Hebrew cosmology and has, with slight additions from Greek thought, handed it on to subsequent generations. The earth was supposed to be the immovable centre of the universe; the sun, moon and stars its satellites and ministers; and Man, central to the earth — the result of a special act of creation, the apex of God's creative work — and not only the centre of the earth, but the centre of the universe itself, the 'lord of creation.' But, the familiar story went on, this highly favoured being, through the fault of his first parents, fell out of his gracious condition, so that the whole race is involved in sinfulness and justly subject to the wrath of God.

Hardly any of this can be believed by any modern intelligent person. A revolution has taken place in our thought; and it is perhaps worth while to remind ourselves of the stages through which this revolution has passed. It can almost be dated. The first date is 1543, the year in which Copernicus pub-

* Annual sermon preached to the Modern Churchmen's Union in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, on Wednesday, 20th May, 1936.

lished his 'Celestial Revolutions,' suggesting the epoch-making theory that the earth moved round the sun and thus denying its central position in the universe. We need not wonder that the Church opposed this theory for a long time, or that so great a man as John Wesley refused to accept something which seemed so contrary to the truth revealed in Scripture. It was, in fact, not until 1822 that the 'Celestial Revolutions' was taken off the Index of Prohibited Books in the Roman Catholic Church and the earth, as we may say, gained the permission of the Pope to move round the sun. There is no need to dwell on the subsequent development which sprang from this small beginning. We now see our planet as only one among innumerable celestial bodies.

The second date is, as you will have anticipated, the year 1859, when Darwin published *The Origin of Species*. He was not, indeed, the originator of the theory of evolution. It had been in men's minds for a considerable period before that time. But he brought it down, as it were, to earth, and showed how evolution might have worked through the theory of natural selection. And though there is considerable debate, I understand, at the present time concerning the scope of natural selection and its adequacy as an explanatory cause, yet it seems to be quite certain that man is in a definite relation with the lower animals, that he is the product of an inconceivably slow development from very humble beginnings, and seems to come into the world, not 'trailing clouds of glory,' but rather dragging behind him instincts from the jungle.

I cannot give a precise date for the last wave of intellectual revolution, because I cannot remember when it was that Freud published the first edition of his 'Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis.' But it was in the lifetime of many of us. The psychological analysis of the human mind is the last stage of the intellectual revolution. All through the previous period it seemed possible to regard man as pre-eminently a rational being. But psychological analysis—in many of its forms, at least—seems to suggest rather that, so far from being rational beings, we are predominantly creatures of impulse, hurried hither and thither by forces welling up from the mysterious depths of our being which are beyond our conscious knowledge, as they are

beyond our control; and that many, if not all, of our acts which we think are well-considered and carefully planned are only rationalized instincts. We find persuasive reasons for doing what we should have done anyhow.

This very rough and sketchy outline of what has happened in the development of thought concerning this question, What is man? seems to lead us to a position which is worth pondering. It seems clear that there is a danger that man may begin to lose faith in himself. For if the Reason which has built up the sciences, which has discovered the celestial revolutions, which has invented the theory of evolution, is itself undermined by the results of scientific research, it looks as if man were confronted with a situation in which it will be necessary to reassure him, not so much that God is true, as that he himself has a spiritual status as being the bearer of intellectual and moral values. However that may be, there is obviously an acute crisis for the Christian religion; and our business as Modern Churchmen is to consider whether there is a way out of this. Are we compelled to adopt a reactionary attitude, to say, 'Well, if modern thought and modern knowledge are plainly at variance with the Christian tradition and revelation, so much the worse for modern thought. We will stand firmly on the old way'? We, as Modern Churchmen, believe that that is not the way to meet the crisis, but that there is a better way, *i.e.* an attempt to show that the essential truth of the Christian idea of man is not in fact contradicted by modern knowledge, when that is properly understood. It is our business to show that it is possible, and we can only do so by trying to do it. Let me, then, in the time that remains to me, suggest in a very superficial manner how I would approach the answer to this question, What is man? in the light of Scriptural revelation and of modern knowledge.

There are, I think, two points upon which the Christian conception and doctrine of Man have always turned: and both these truths are dressed in the Bible in symbolical or even mythological language. The first is summed up in the statement that *Man is made in the image of God*. No doubt in its first intention this phrase partook of the childlike outlook of early religions. It may even be that those who first made this assertion interpreted it in a physical way and conceived man as

having been made after the bodily form of his Creator. The content of this thought has changed as man's mind has grown and as his conscience has become more sensitive. But the root idea does not change — that there is a kinship between man and God, that man is not wholly 'other than' the divine; and for us developed Christians, inheriting our great theological tradition, the 'image of God' means that man is endowed with the capacity of thought by which he is enabled not only to seek for truth but in a measure to find it. It means that man is endowed with a freedom by reason of which he is a being responsible for his actions and with power over the direction of his life. And it means that Man is Spirit, by which I understand that he is able not only to direct himself, but to direct himself in accordance with far-reaching — nay, universal — ideas of goodness which transcend the interests and needs of the individual. That is what being 'made in the image of God' means. Is there anything which is firmly established and incontrovertible in modern knowledge which would forbid us to believe this concerning ourselves? It is alleged, perhaps, that the idea of evolution is somehow in contradiction with this faith. But surely a moment's reflection is sufficient to show that this is by no means true. Our conceptions of evolution have been undergoing a transformation during the last generation; and we are now told that we should conceive the process of evolution as a process of 'emergence,' one in which new and higher types of being come into existence. It does not need, I think, any very profound philosophical insight to see that, when we are told that evolution is a process of emergence, we are at liberty to think of it as a process of creation. There is, in essence, no difference between saying that God created man through a process of evolution and saying that God created him at the beginning of things and planted him in a garden. The essential truth is the same — that man is God's child, that man is indeed the crown and apex of God's creation.

And then, I suppose, there are many who are haunted by what I may perhaps call the illusion of man's smallness. They say: 'How incredible that one who is hardly a speck upon the surface of one of the smallest planets, a negligible piece of this vast mysterious universe — how inconceivable that he should be

the image of God, of the Creator, that he should be in any sense the special care and interest of the Mind behind phenomena!' And indeed if we were thinking of man's body that would be so. But we are not thinking of man's body; we are thinking of him as mind and spirit; and the illusion of smallness consists in thinking that that which is confined for a time in a small space is necessarily itself small in worth. Who is it that has discovered the vastness and the mystery of the universe? It is man. So far as we know, nowhere else in 'this vast scheme of things' is there any knowledge of how great and how intricate and how mysterious that scheme is. We should celebrate not the littleness of man, but his greatness. For it is man who has developed the science which tells him what the universe is like.

And can we still say, in spite of the psychologists, or some of them, that man is free and man is spirit? I assert that we can. The truth of our freedom rests upon an experience which is as authentic and as undeniable as any upon which science itself is based. We cannot deny that we feel and know ourselves to be free. We cannot contradict that which is of the very essence of our personality. No one can disprove this, which is so primal in our experience. Nay, we can think of the development of man, his progress in the world, as the growth of his freedom both as individual and as race. He acquires, as he proceeds, power over nature, power over his environment; and we may hope that, before he has finished his course, he will acquire power over himself.

Nor can it be denied that man is Spirit, able to direct himself in accordance with universal ideals and laws. Even in man's greatest distress and dejection, when he seems to be most utterly defeated and all his hopes seem to be unfulfilled, he can still, deep down in his heart, feel that somehow what he knows to be good can yet be achieved and enjoyed in this world. Man is still, we believe with confidence, the image of God.

But our Christian faith used to go on to say that man was God's *defaced* image. There were some kinds of Christianity which added that the image which had formerly existed was totally obliterated by the Fall, so that there remained no vestige of 'original righteousness.' I do not think that even our Thirty-nine Articles go quite so far as that. At any rate it has not been the Catholic tradition so to think. That has been rather that the

image of God has been distorted and obscured, but not destroyed; it remains still, showing through the mire and dust which the earth has imposed upon it. Can we still think of man as a fallen child of God? I suggest that, when we consider it in a cool hour, we discover that religion as such has no interest in the question how evil began. If we are of a philosophical turn of mind, we can discuss how evil entered into God's world as long as we like and 'find no end, in wandering mazes lost.' But from the standpoint of religion this is, strictly speaking, irrelevant. What religion is concerned with is *the fact* of evil; and when we concentrate our reflection on that, is there not evidence enough that the image of God is in fact distorted and overlaid? Think, for instance, how man's sincerest efforts after truth seem to be constantly dogged and thwarted by the intrusion of error. Think of how much misery has come upon the world through the quite honest mistakes of people who have had no interest, as they thought, but to discover what was true and right. Truth, though we may know it in part, never comes to us quite pure. Freedom, for which man thirsts, and always has thirsted, never seems to come to him in full and secure measure; always it is limited. He is oppressed by personal and social compulsions. And when man is most spiritual and filled with the highest ideals, yet always he is conscious that his motives are mixed and that he serves the City of God with a divided mind.

It is true, is it not? that man is a being needing redemption. The image of God, which is really there, needs, not perhaps, as the old traditional theology said, to be restored to what it was in some paradisical beginning of things, but to be re-created as it is in God's purpose. Man needs the re-creating Spirit of God.

Such, in brief outline, is the way in which we might approach this question of which so much of our modern crisis is comprised, What is man? And, in conclusion, I would suggest that the subject is not merely academic. It is not just a matter of theological debate. It is, on the contrary, one of immense social importance. I even believe that the whole future of the human race may depend upon whether a considerable proportion of it will go on holding the Christian idea of man. It has always seemed strange to me that many progressive thinkers should find such a fatal fascination in determinism, supposing that something has been

achieved for progress when they have shown that man is nothing but a puppet. If you could indeed show that we are the slaves of necessity and have no power over ourselves, you would have done the worst possible day's work for any hope of the future. It is only in the faith that man is a being who can be changed, a being who can be persuaded, whose will can be influenced and allured from evil to good, that we can have any hope for the progress of mankind. 'What is man that thou art mindful of him?' 'Let us make man in our image.' 'Christ the express image of the Father.'

BOOK REVIEWS

THE ENIGMA OF MUHAMMAD*

Muhammad, no less than the religion he founded, is an enigma that has never yet been solved.

Every time one finds a new book about Muhammad by a real scholar one opens it in hope that at length the riddle of this powerful but inconsistent figure will be answered. There is no doubt about Prof. Tor Andrae's scholarship, or of the great contribution he has already given to the study of Islamic origins. For that reason our disappointment is the greater that, on finishing reading his book, we feel no nearer answering the vital questions 'Was Muhammad sincere?' and 'Was Muhammad inspired?'

Up to page 200 the author has tried to present Muhammad in a favourable light, as a man genuinely religious and guided by the highest motives. But when he comes to the attack on an unarmed caravan in one of the months when the Arabs observed truce, the white-washing process becomes impossible: 'It can hardly be denied that these events cast a shadow upon his character'; 'What offends us is the calculating slyness with which he cleverly provokes Abdallah's action without assuming any responsibility for what occurred.' After such an admission one feels that the author ought to have gone back over the earlier part of his book to see whether this proven slyness and disregard of the common moral law did not show itself in earlier incidents.

The elucidation of Muhammad's character is indeed a formidable historical task, and probably Tor Andrae would not claim that he has attempted more than to write afresh the current judgment of scholars, modified to some slight extent by a few new hypotheses about him. In dealing with the life of Christ the problem is in a sense easier, for, however far Christian contemplation, piety and speculation have related Him to the eternal order of things, there has rarely been absent from Christian consciousness the true objective facts of His historical life. The existence of the four gospels, recording the facts as faithfully as was possible at that time, has prevented Christian piety or wild imagination from creating a different Christ. But with Muhammad it is otherwise. Muhammadan piety from

* *Tor Andrae: Mohammed, the Man and his Faith.* Translated by Theophil Menzel. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London. 1936. 8/6.)

the earliest times began rewriting the life of Muhammad to fit in with the Islam that developed in the first three centuries, and produced a figure which is not merely theologically but historically a myth. The modern historical student has to discard the whole picture of the perfect man, the model for all ages, the miracle-worker, and search the earliest sources to reconstruct the true historical figure who is quite unknown to modern Muslims. It may be that the materials available will never be sufficient for the fulfilment of that task; but at any rate a great deal of critical work must be done, historical and literary criticism of the Qur'an, of the earliest Lives of the Prophet, and of the Traditions, before the task of reconstructing his history and his character can be begun.

An interesting problem is raised by the author concerning Muhammad's belief that there had been a primitive revelation of monotheism to the Arabs. Most scholars are agreed that Muhammad was wrong in this supposition, and simply argued from the monotheism of other countries. Tor Andrae is inclined to agree with Muhammad on this point. He says (p. 33):

> 'It is actually possible that the belief in Allah, the creator of the world, the giver of rain, the founder of sacred customs, and the Mighty One who watches over the sacredness of oaths, is part of the autochthonous religion of Arabia.'

He compares this Arabian monotheism with the supposed primitive monotheism of many uncivilised tribes of the present day. The comparison is very doubtfully justified, and in any case such 'primitive monotheisms' appear to be more truly described as mythology than as religion, and do not appear to be capable of developing into a monotheistic cult. Apart from Muhammad's own statements, the only evidence for traces of monotheism in Arabia is in a few passages of the pre-Islamic poetry. But opinion of scholars is divided about this poetry. Possibly the whole of it is a later Muslim fabrication; or Muslim hands may have revised earlier poems; while the few poems that touch religion may have been written by Christian Arabs, or Arabs belonging to tribes which were partly Christian. What, however, is clear is that the Arabs did not accept Muhammad's claims because their minds were prepared by a preliminary belief in monotheism. Some accepted Islam because they were attracted to the strong character of Muhammad. The majority accepted it because they had to, and would certainly have abandoned it after his death had it not been for the strong hand of Abu Bakr. As for Muhammad himself, his religious ideas grew up in the stream of popular current religious thought of surrounding nations. Mecca stood on one of the world's great highways, and, whether Muhammad himself was a trader or not, he must have spent many an evening in social intercourse with Syrians and Egyptians, with Christians and Jews from those countries and from the north and south borders of Arabia. Accustomed to such company, in which monotheism was naturally assumed to be true, Muhammad would not need to seek a possible basis for monotheism in vague ideas hidden behind Arabian polytheism.

What we need to remember is that Muhammad, in borrowing monotheism, did not borrow the underlying moral conceptions of God. Bearing this fact in mind we can quite well speak of him as being inspired, without understanding by 'inspiration' what it would mean to a Christian or a Jew; and we can agree with Tor Andrae when he says (p. 69):

> 'It is a natural enough process that an originally spontaneous inspiration should be transformed more and more into an inspiration

of ideas, becoming increasingly subject to the control of the conscious will. We see how the Prophet gradually grew accustomed to think of ideas that emerged in his consciousness and decisions that matured in his soul as direct expressions of the Divine will.'

In his later life Muhammad showed clearly traits of character which would be blameworthy in a Christian or a Jew; but remembering his less moral conception of God, and lower type of inspiration, we need not assume (as many authors have done) a falling away from a more truly religious attitude at the beginning of his career as a prophet.

On page 81 Tor Andrae says:

'What made the Prophet certain that the message of the judgment and retribution must needs be true was a genuine glowing *faith in the God of judgment,* in His incomparable majesty, and His unqualified right to punish those who opposed His sovereign will. The real theme of Muhammad's preaching is rooted in religious experience, in a great and unique personal piety.'

That is perfectly true, but the piety he knew was the fear of the Lord in which 'fear' has its original meaning. Its parallels are to be found in the Books of Samuel rather than in Isaiah. His conception of God is well summarised as follows (p. 84):

'He sends punishments at will, and when He so desires He shows mercy and postpones His judgment. There are no laws or principles which restrain His will. It may be said, of course, that He is good, gracious, merciful, and righteous. But goodness and righteousness are not norms by which His conduct may be determined or predicted.'

This conception has been strengthened, and not seriously altered, in later Islam.

As far as Arabia was concerned Muhammad was a reformer. On pages 108f. we read:

'Muhammad was unable completely to abolish blood-vengeance. Apparently it was too deeply rooted in the legal conceptions of the Arabs. But he attempted to check the most striking abuse of this primitive custom by stipulating that only *one* life could be taken, the life of a free man for a free man, of a woman for a woman, of a slave for a slave.'

The parallel to the class legislation of Hammurabi is obvious. Muhammad as a reformer was a Semite of the type of Hammurabi. As a lawgiver he does not approach the lawgivers of the Old Testament, any more than as a prophet he approaches the writing prophets of the Old Testament. On the other hand he was far more of a nation-builder than Moses: he made the Arab nation out of a great number of warring tribes; and it is surprising to read on page 173 that 'it was really clear to the opposition in Mecca that adherence to his faith signified a certain rejection of national solidarity.' It is true that there were certain customs common to all Arabia, but there was no link between the tribes before Muhammad which could properly be called 'national solidarity.'

The criticisms here offered of details of the book must not be taken to impugn it as a whole. In our present state of knowledge it probably represents as fair a statement of Muhammad's life and character as can be given in short compass. Most of the earlier Lives of Muhammad suffer either from the use of unreliable sources or from a biassed view-point. But

we can still look forward to the time when a more thoroughgoing study of the sources will enable this or some other author to write a history of his life with greater certainty, and delineate his character and his place in history with greater precision.

L. E. Browne.

RELIGION IN NINETEENTH CENTURY FRANCE*

Canon Sparrow Simpson is one of the most scholarly of Anglo-Catholic writers, and the list of his published works shows a very wide range of interests. He has special knowledge of the Church in France, and has written on St. Bernard and on French Catholics of the nineteenth century. The present book contains much useful information and brings one into contact with many personalities who are little known to the ordinary English reader. Perhaps because of his own extensive acquaintance with ecclesiastical matters in France the writer does not, we think, sufficiently appreciate the prevailing ignorance of things French among Englishmen, and his book has therefore a somewhat desultory and supplementary character; it lacks a broad background against which his figures might be seen to move. We gather from the publisher's notice that some passages in the book have already appeared in the *Church Times* and the *Expositor*. This may explain a want of coherence in the whole which is sometimes apparent.

The religious history of France during the nineteenth century, as of Europe in general, falls roughly into two divisions which correspond pretty exactly to the two halves of the century. From 1800 to 1850 there was a religious revival, a return, sentimental perhaps rather than intellectual, to orthodox belief, and a reaction against the preceding Age of Enlightenment. The chief obstacle to the returning tide of faith in France was political rather than religious, the feeling among the middle classes that the Church stood for reaction in politics, and the memory of the anti-national attitude of the French priesthood at the beginning of the revolutionary wars. Lamennais, the French Newman, advocated an alliance between Catholicism and democracy, though he experienced the usual fate of pioneers, was denounced by the Pope and died an isolated and tragic figure, trying to substitute faith in Socialism for faith in the Church. His pupil Lacordaire by judicious temporising and submission managed to carry out a part of his master's ideas and proved that political liberalism was not inconsistent with Catholic faith. Canon Sparrow Simpson only once mentions Lamennais, and then as 'the former Catholic, now Freethinker,' whose former association with Lacordaire rendered the latter suspect. The ignorant reader would hardly gather from this that in the 1820's Lamennais had been the most eloquent and uncompromising advocate of ultramontane Catholicism.

With the turn of the century there began everywhere that gradual undermining of the old orthodoxy, Catholic and Protestant, by the advancing tide of knowledge, which has continued to flow almost unchecked down to our own day. Geology, biology, archaeology, removed landmark after landmark, while the new science of the systematic study of literary sources supplied a more subtle dissolvent. It was only by slow degrees that this new knowledge percolated down to the general consciousness, but its influence was none the less perceptible as early as the fifties. No doubt there were causes other than intellectual at work connected with the grow-

* *Religious Thought in France in the Nineteenth Century.* By Canon W. J. Sparrow Simpson. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 1935. 5/-.)

ing urbanisation of Western Europe. In France, indeed, the reign of Napoleon III was associated with the apparent triumph of the Church; she regained her control of schools and universities, and a succession of eloquent preachers, of whom an interesting account is given by Canon Simpson in his thirteenth chapter, Lacordaire, the Jesuit Felix, the Carmelite Père Hyacinthe, enthralled the crowds that filled Notre Dame to overflowing. Montalembert, the lay protagonist of the Catholic movement, is quoted as saying of the lectures of Lacordaire:

> 'No one of us had ever heard the like, and of those who that day heard them, none will ever forget them. They will never forget those days when the chord of the beautiful, the true, the great, and the good, vibrated in their hearts under the might of that voice: those days in which they saw bursting forth from a priestly breast, as from the rock struck by the Divine rod, that impetuous crystal stream, surging and irresistible as an Alpine torrent.'

The Protestant Guizot testifies to the extraordinary spell that he cast over all sorts and conditions of men:

> 'A numerous auditory, young and old, from the salons and from the schools, believers and freethinkers, flocked round the Abbé Lacordaire, all feeling the attraction, and almost all the charm; many among them yielding to the persuasion of that eloquence, so fresh and vivid, and abundant and unlooked for.'

But in the long run the patronage of the pleasure-seekers and stock-jobbers who surrounded the Man of December did the cause of religion more harm than good. The condonation of the *coup d'état* of 1851 by the Catholic Church was never forgiven by the intellectuals. The Church has thriven under the storms of revolutionary persecution; it wilted in the sun of imperial favour. And after *l'année terrible* and the downfall of the imperial régime, the ill-advised attempt of the Catholics to bring back the Bourbons made the cry of Gambetta, *'Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi,'* reverberate in every republican heart.

There have been, of course, counter-eddies. The vulgar bigotry of the anti-clericals, the excesses of the Naturalist school, have sickened more refined natures.

> 'The approval or actual return to Faith on the part of such writers as Bourget, Coppée, Huysmans, Faguet, and Brunetière, besides Claudel and Peguy, is too remarkable to be ignored.'

One of the best sentences in the book is that with which it closes:

> 'It must be frankly confessed that among the conversions to Catholicism in nineteenth-century France are examples which, while they yield unhesitating veneration to the superiority of the moral ideals and resources of the Christian religion over the prevalent morals and ideals of the world outside, betray a disregard of the tremendous Dogmas on which the morals of that religion are based, a disregard which is unintelligent and disconcerting.'

Much the same might be said of many conversions to Catholicism in England.

The chapter on Biblical and historical studies among Catholics in France is melancholy reading. How indeed can anybody, however orthodox his faith, write on Biblical subjects when, as we are told, the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* of January 5th, 1921, declares that inerrancy extends to

every part of the Bible, and that every assertion of a sacred writer is exempt from mistake? Nor is this all. One cannot even decide for oneself what the sacred writers have said. I John v, 7, it is admitted by a learned Catholic commentator, was not in the Latin text up to the ninth century, but the Congregation of the Inquisition in 1897 declared that one cannot with security deny or doubt its authenticity. Modern Roman Catholic commentators must be like canaries in a cage. They may sing as sweetly as they will, but they must not attempt any independent flight.

The publisher's notice says that the book traces 'the gradual but general wakening of belief' among the Protestants 'in regard to Christ, to Redemption, and to the Church.' This looks at first sight as if the writer of the notice had not read the book; but it is more charitable to suppose that 'wakening' is a misprint for 'weakening.' A similar correction of 'weakened' for 'wakened' would improve the sense of a passage on p. 116.

GAMALIEL MILNER.

THE FAITH OF A SCHOOLMASTER*

The keynote of Mr. Sharwood Smith's work at Newbury is thus outlined by the author:

> 'The first is for the encouragement of the creative impulse; the second is for greater responsibility and for more self-government; the third is for directness and sincerity particularly in questions relating to sex and religion' (p. 230).

His application of the first point to the study of the classics appears to be an extreme: to awaken the urge to master Greek grammar by studying the great writers in translation may be dangerous: the risk of anti-climax is too great. [In the reviewer's own case, he was learning Greek in special circumstances, and, side by side with grammar, was reading Plato's *Apology;* the result has been that he has found it very difficult to turn to any other prose author after Plato.]

With the desire for greater responsibility we are in complete agreement. The relationship between the senior boys and masters becomes much more human if the boys have some share in the government of the school; while the influence of school-fellows is generally much greater in suppressing minor failings than that of the staff, especially as the prefect has his finger on the pulse of the school more closely than is possible for the master.

The questions of religion and sex are perhaps the most difficult that any master is called upon to face. With regard to the former, most schools which have no chaplain are likely to be at a loss for a well-informed teacher, more particularly because it is not considered to be a subject calling for specialisation: and where there is a chaplain, it is almost impossible to avoid giving offence to one of the many denominations from which members of the school are drawn. On the subject of sex, generally ignored in schools, except where its taboos are violated, it is difficult, if not impossible, to generalize: while plain speaking and sincerity are essential, different circumstances call for varied handling. Mr. Sharwood Smith has, however, dealt very wisely with the problem by bringing to it a common-sense attitude of mind.

Turning to the wider aspect of education, and its application to the world, the author feels, as all schoolmasters must feel, this great difficulty:

* *The Faith of a Schoolmaster.* By E. Sharwood Smith. (Methuen and Co., Ltd. 1935. 6/-.)

on the one hand, every master who has the wider culture at heart wishes to educate the boy in the fullest sense of the term; but the future employer, considering the boy as a prospective clerk, demands a set standard in certain subjects and, as his guarantee that he is getting what he wants, asks for School Certificate or Matriculation.

To obtain the certificate, each boy must undergo an examination which, on account of its widespread nature, can take no notice of individual or local conditions; and the school syllabus must be drafted always with this end in view. In place of this system, Mr. Sharwood Smith would adopt a regional system, grouping together the secondary schools around each university: schools would be free to select, within wide limits, the type of education best suited for their locality, and would be visited annually by a panel of examiners, appointed jointly by the university and schools: after reference to the headmaster's record, and oral and written questions, the examiners would be able to decide as to the boy's ability and his fitness for the granting of a certificate, which would permit the recipient to enter any university, and exempt him from professional preliminary examinations.

The obvious merit of the system is that it takes into consideration individuality. Its defects are in the main twofold: the secondary school education would tend to be strongly localized, a point which Mr. Sharwood Smith is anxious to avoid; and this difficulty would undoubtedly arise with regard to the relative standards of different universities.

The author has expressed in this book thoughts which must have been in the minds of all thinking schoolmasters: further, he has had the courage and faith to put his ideas into practice. While many may disagree with him, his ideas are worthy of serious consideration by all who have the best interests of education at heart.

F. Bonner.

A NEW EDITION OF THE GOSPELS*

The text is that of the Authorised Version; it is printed as in an ordinary book in paragraphs, and inverted commas are used. Chapters but not verses are indicated in the margin.

The Revisers of 1880 stressed the necessity of printing the text in paragraphs, and this was done in the original editions of the R.V. In recent editions, however, the text has once more been murdered by being split up into verses, and it has been impossible for some years to buy a R.V. Bible in paragraphs with the revisers' notes in reasonable print. However, it is a welcome change to see the revisers' suggestion being adopted for the A.V.

It is a great pity that verses are not indicated by numbers in the margin as is done in the Long Primer R.V. N.T. Indeed, when an admirably printed N.T. in the Revised Version can be had for 2/6 one wonders if the present edition of the Gospels will be in much demand.

Two important notes are placed at the end of the volume—one on Mark xvi, 9-20, and the other on John vii, 53—viii, 11. It is a pity that any editions of the N.T. are published without at least the former.

R. R. Lewis.

* *The Four Gospels.* Cambridge Miscellany, 17. (Cambridge University Press. 1936. 3/6.)

CORRESPONDENCE

JESUIT *VERSUS* BENEDICTINE.

SIR, To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman.*

May I comment on the article 'Jesuit *versus* Benedictine' in your last number? Mr. Hardwick makes three main accusations against the Jesuits.

(1) He asserts that they are engaged in a vast intrigue for the purpose of discrediting the Benedictines in England, and especially at Downside. No evidence is given for this charge except that one Jesuit has demurred to certain passages in one book by a Benedictine — not as heretical but as being liable to misconstruction. Has Mr. Hardwick drawn entirely on his imagination for the rest?

(2) He asserts that the Jesuits are permitting a pamphlet on Teresa Higginson to be sold in their church at Manchester in order, by this means, to pervert the spiritual life of the faithful. In reply to this it should be pointed out that the memory of Teresa Higginson is held in very high regard among Catholics in the North of England, where she lived most of her life, and that there is a strong popular movement to obtain her canonisation. Her cause will be brought to Rome for a decision in due course, where it will naturally receive a much more careful and impartial examination than Mr. Hardwick seems to have given it. Meanwhile the whole question is to be regarded as *sub judice*. It would hardly be proper for any parish priest or religious order to anticipate the verdict of the Holy See by placing a ban on all literature concerning her. Mr. Hardwick would have put the incident in a much more accurate proportion if he had mentioned the fact that in large Roman Catholic churches there are normally at least a hundred different Catholic Truth Society pamphlets on sale, and that any single one would occupy a very modest place among the rest. Yet this appears to be the sole basis for his disparaging remarks on Jesuit piety.

(3) He concludes with a very sweeping condemnation of Jesuit spiritual direction, and implies that it is directly antagonistic to Benedictine methods. A sufficient answer to this charge is contained in Dom Chapman's book itself. I will quote, without comment, two passages which speak for themselves. The first is from Dom Hudleston's introduction, the second from one of Dom Chapman's letters:

'In the last decade or so of his life, [Dom Chapman] obtained more help from Père de Caussade, S.J., and especially from his letters, than from any writer since St. Francis de Sales. Two others whom he loved and quoted frequently were Blosius and the Jesuit Père Grou, whose *Maximes spirituelles* was the only book besides his Breviary which he took with him to the nursing-home where he died' (p. 24, 2nd edition).

'I am always so grateful to you for introducing me to Père de Caussade. I think he is the best spiritual guide since St. Francis de Sales' (p. 98).

It seems almost incredible that a clergyman of the Church of England should make such grave and insulting charges against a great Christian body on such absurdly inadequate evidence. It serves the cause neither of Christian charity nor of healthy, mutual understanding and seems intended only to sow suspicion between two of the great religious orders of the Catholic Church.

J. L. RUSSELL.

22 Museum Road, Oxford.
May 25th, 1936.

JESUIT *VERSUS* BENEDICTINE.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

Mr. Hardwick, in an article which professes to be 'A Study of Jesuit Methods,' informs your readers that the Jesuits 'know how to feed the masses with nonsense calculated to keep them doped and servile,' adding that they 'strain out Abbot Chapman's supposed Molinism and swallow the camel of Teresa Higginson's gross and degrading superstition.'

The controversy over Abbot Chapman's letters cannot be discussed without long quotations. Anyone who wishes to form a judgment upon the matter must read the documents of the case for himself. Mr. Hardwick seeks to give piquancy to his *résumé* by imputing despicable motives to Abbot Chapman's critics—a very convenient form of attack; for motives can neither be proved nor disproved.

If, however, we turn from the alleged defamation of Abbot Chapman to the alleged glorification of Teresa Higginson, a reader may more easily measure Mr. Hardwick's bias and the recklessness regarding facts which inspires his criticism. *The Month*, your contributor points out, is 'the Jesuit organ.' But *The Month*, strange to say, has on several occasions and in the strongest terms drawn attention to the hysterical features conspicuous in the two published Lives of Teresa Higginson. I enclose offprints of two such articles (January, 1925, pp. 58 *seq.*, and September, 1933, pp. 206, *seq.*). The concluding sentence of the former article, summarising what has preceded, runs in these terms:

> 'In spite of Teresa's mortified life and protestations of unworthiness there is a latent element of self absorption which seems to point more in the direction of hysteria than of true sanctity, and I venture to think it regrettable that a Memoir so crowded with unverified marvels should have been presented to the Catholic public without a word of caution as a trustworthy record of heroic virtue.'

If the Jesuits were bent on 'pushing' Teresa Higginson they would hardly have been foremost in disparaging her claims to saintship in their own periodical. The curious point is that it was a Benedictine who was the first to print the story of her life and to profess unbounded admiration for her marvellous graces. I am not saying that the Benedictines as a body are committed to the same view, but I should be surprised if the pamphlet which Mr. Hardwick mentions is not sold in their Lancashire churches as in the Jesuit church where your contributor says he purchased it. The selection of the pamphlets exposed for sale is generally left to the box tender and the clergy rarely have anything to do with it. As there is talk of the possibility of the beatification of Teresa Higginson, the people of Lancashire are naturally interested in the story of one who lived in their midst.

May I add that I should be sorry to suppose that the advertisement of works by Ernst Haeckel, J. M. Robertson, Joseph McCabe, Grant Allen, etc., on a prominent page of the *Modern Churchman* identifies that periodical with the ideas predominantly advocated in 'The Thinker's Library.'

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

SIR,

May I reply to Mr. Russell's points *seriatim*?

(1) I nowhere speak of 'a vast intrigue.' What I say is that the attack on Abbot Chapman's *Letters* 'would seem to be prompted by Jesuit jealousy of the rising influence of the Benedictines in England,' and that 'It is not Abbot Chapman *the individual* whom the Jesuits are attacking and seeking to discredit, but the English Benedictines, and especially the Benedictine Abbey of Downside and its growing influence in the influential circles which the Jesuits wish to keep as their own special preserve.'

'No evidence is given for this,' says Mr. Russell. I indeed adduce no evidence for the hatching of 'a vast intrigue,' of which I do not affirm the existence; but I give several instances of what I consider unfair criticism of Abbot Chapman in Archbishop Goodier's *Month* articles. For a detailed examination of the Archbishop's attack I must refer Mr. Russell to Dom Roger Hudleston's two articles in the *Downside Review*. The fact that Abbot Vonier should also have entered the lists in the *Dublin Review* in defence of the *Letters*, suggests that it was the feeling amongst intelligent non-Jesuit Catholics that Abbot Chapman had not had a fair deal.

The only evidence, says Mr. Russell, which I *do* adduce is 'that one Jesuit has demurred to certain passages in one book by a Benedictine—not as heretical, but as being liable to misconstruction.' Now, 'demurring' is a very mild word to use for the Archbishop's strictures ('stricture' is his Grace's own word). For example, his Grace says:

> 'Though in my lifetime I have read many volumes of letters by spiritual writers, yet never have I come across a collection which has needed to be introduced with so many warnings, both as to the author, as to the letters themselves, and as to the persons to whom they were written.'

Then it has to be taken into account that the 'one Jesuit' was an Archbishop, and that his attack was given the leading place in the Jesuit organ, *The Month*. Supposing that the Bishop of Birmingham were to deliver an attack upon some theologian in an article prominently displayed in the *Modern Churchman*, would not the victim be entitled to feel that the attack had at least the sympathetic goodwill of Anglican Modernists?

(2) I nowhere assert that the Teresa Higginson pamphlet was sold 'in order to pervert the spiritual life of the faithful.' I say that the pamphlet is nonsense, but I nowhere say it is very dangerous nonsense. I only allude to this entertaining little work at all because it strikes me as strange that the Jesuits should so far approve of it as to permit its sale in one of their most important Churches, while they pass grave strictures upon Abbot Chapman's *Letters*—a work of first class importance and of the very highest quality. Why strain out the gnat and swallow the camel? I was aware that there is a movement afoot to get Teresa Higginson canonised; and no one would welcome a serious Life of her more than myself. Though I doubt if a serious life would assist her canonisation.

(3) I nowhere say or imply that Jesuit spiritual direction 'is directly antagonistic to Benedictine methods.' What I said (and still affirm) is that the Jesuit monopoly of influence over educated Catholics in England is now being challenged by the rising influence of the Benedictines. If Abbot Chapman was a typical Benedictine, I should expect the Jesuits not to welcome Benedictine influence over the laity, since their ideals of direction would conflict with Jesuit ideals. 'As to "direction,"' the Abbot writes, 'I think most people want very little of it. The good director is like a

nurse who teaches children how to walk alone.' Is that the Jesuit ideal? I venture to think not.

And as for Abbot Chapman having been indicted, as he frequently states, to de Caussade, who was a Jesuit, this does not damage my case, since I nowhere say or imply that no good thing can come out of the Society. On the contrary, I commend the following passage from the *Spiritual Exercises* of the Founder of that Society to the attention of the Archbishop:

> 'In order that both the giver and the receiver of the Exercises may be better helped and benefitted, it must be presupposed that every good Christian must be more ready to excuse the proposition of another than to condemn it; and if he cannot save it, let him inquire how he understands it: if he understands it wrongly, let him correct him with love.'

As for Fr. Thurston's criticism of my article, he says 'the controversy over Abbot Chapman's letters cannot be discussed without long quotations,' and adds that I 'seek to give piquancy to a résumé of the case by imparting despicable motives to Abbot Chapman's critics.' In my article I do not shirk making out my case for unfairness; I supply two instances of it and refer my readers to Dom Hudleston for more. Not till I have established my case for unfairness do I attribute motives. It is true that 'motives cannot be proved or disproved,' but if there is unfair criticism, one is entitled to seek its origin. And this is to be found either in a desire (conscious or unconscious) to misrepresent and mislead, or in a lack of perception and intelligence. Fr. Thurston can have it which way he likes; but 'despicable' is his adjective, not mine.

There is much virtue in Fr. Thurston's plural—'critics.' I nowhere use the plural, but speak only of one critic, his Grace the Archbishop. The insidious plural suggests that the late Abbot had a number of critics, that the *Letters* caused widespread scandal and dismay, and were a notorious trap for souls, so that the *Month* attack was only voicing a generally accepted, though not yet widely expressed, opinion. The truth is that the only other hostile criticism which came to my notice appeared in an issue of *The Catholic Times* which I did not see and did not think it worth while to mention (and, by the bye, I have not heard of the *Catholic Times* taking offence at my article, though *The Universe* brands it as 'vicious and vulgar').

As for the 'Teresa Higginson' pamphlet, I am glad to learn that *The Month* has criticised it, and I now hear that it is no longer on sale at the Holy Name, Manchester. But even so I cannot justly be convicted of 'recklessness regarding facts.' A friend purchased the pamphlet in the church indicated, and its sale there seemed to me, in my innocence, to be sufficient evidence that it was sponsored and approved by the Jesuit Fathers whose church it is. I did not realise that the Jesuit reputation for skill and infinite carefulness in matters of propaganda was so ill-founded that they actually leave the selection of literature for sale in their churches to underlings, vergers, caretakers, and what not. The matter ought to be looked into by the General of the Order. But why does not some Jesuit write an objective Life of the prospective saint for the information, if not the edification, of the faithful in Lancashire?

J. C. HARDWICK.

The Vicarage,
Partington, Manchester.
June 3rd, 1936.

MODERN POETRY.

SIR,

I suspect that Mr. Bulkeley's article on 'Modern Poetry' has already provoked so large a measure of remonstrance from abler pens than mine that my letter may serve only the purpose of adding quantity to quality of protest.

But it is perhaps worth while to make a point which the more outraged lover of 'modern impressionist' poetry will perhaps overlook.

It would I believe be possible to meet Mr. Bulkeley on his own ground and to show that Robert Browning was himself at least as obscure, and with less reason as difficult, as some modern poets, without their excuse that their age, as never before, is seeking new forms and modes of expression. Mr. Bulkeley will remember the conversation about 'Sordello' in Rudolf Besier's play, 'The Barretts of Wimpole Street.'

And so much reputable opinion is disposed to favour what seems to many to be 'difficult' verse that one would have liked Mr. Bulkeley to have acknowledged the possible presence in 'His Father's Garden' of flowers he does not know.

It is, however, the inadequacy of Mr. Bulkeley's estimate with which I find my chief quarrel. Has Mr. Bulkeley never read Mr. Ralph Hodgson's 'Song of Honour'? Has he found nothing of exquisite loveliness and beauty of thought in Mr. Humbert Wolfe? Has he never thrilled to the bitter hatred of war in much of Mr. Siegfried Sassoon? And how most of all can he forbear to bow in grateful humility to the noble author of the 'Testament of Beauty'?

What appears to Mr. Bulkeley to be the modern poet's failure to give 'that testimony to the inherent greatness of man and to his infinite possibilities' appears to me in similar but radically other light. The modern poet is, I believe, more aware than his less thoughtful contemporaries of 'man's infinite possibilities.' But he is bitterly hurt and cruelly disappointed by their tragic frustration in the modern world. The work of Arthur Wragg, with which Mr. Bulkeley will be familiar, is exactly comparable and implies no derogation of the nobility of man.

I do not wish to be understood as disagreeing with much that Mr. Bulkeley writes, but I believe his article to be unfair to much modern poetry, and calculated to prejudice many who may wish to understand the sources of its inspiration, and who genuinely desire to learn and love contemporary poetry, if they may.

E. FREEMAN HUDSON.

St. John's College, Durham.
May 11th, 1936.

SIR,

The references to T. S. Eliot in the article on 'Modern Poetry' in the April-May number of the *Modern Churchman* lead me to the conclusion that Mr. Bulkeley is unacquainted with Mr. Eliot's *Collected Poems*, recently published, and indeed with any of the work following on the 1909 (*not* 1905) volume, also that he has not been fortunate enough to read or to see the most significant Christian play of modern times, 'Murder in the Cathedral.' It is clear that Mr. Bulkeley has failed to apprehend the nature of Mr. Eliot's spiritual pilgrimage, which of course is understandable if he bases his criticism on the 1909-25 volume, although even so it is debatable whether a poet wholly bereft of religious feeling and preoccupied solely with the ignoble in man would be likely to write a poem so pregnant with

horror as 'The Waste Land' (since, of course, extreme horror and revulsion obviously subsumes a realisation of its obverse).

'Eliot is definitely a bad influence,' says Mr. Bulkeley. I would urge exactly the opposite view, and say that to all concerned with contemporary poetry and Christianity, and the relationship between the two, T. S. Eliot at the present time is the best possible influence. The fact that the 'father' of modern poetry has found a 'conclusion to all that is inconclusible' (I quote from 'Ash Wednesday') in the truths of Christianity, and is now deeply concerned to convey his discoveries through the medium of poetry and poetic drama, is one of the most hopeful signs in an age of extreme difficulty for both Christianity and poetry.

DALLAS KENMARE.

Lynthurst Hill, Barnt Green, Worcestershire.
April 20th, 1936.

SIR,

Mr. Hudson's objections to my article suggest that it attempted to give a general criticism or appreciation of modern poetry. Now, the article contained (besides quotations) less than four pages of print, and in the second paragraph I limited its main contentions to 'verse published in the last fifteen years.' So it is hardly fair to blame me for failing to do justice to Robert Bridges and Siegfried Sassoon's war poetry, while the mention of Ralph Hodgson's 'Song of Honour,' published twenty-three years ago, shows a complete misconception of my opinions. This is rather mortifying, for I hoped that I had at least stated them clearly.

For some years I had got little satisfaction out of newly-published verse, and I met other hungry sheep (not all of them middle-aged) complaining that they were unfed. I tried to discover the reasons for our disappointment, and at last set them down briefly and provocatively in a paper intended originally for a small discussion circle. I am grateful to you, sir, for introducing my paper to a wider forum, and I venture to suggest that whatever merit there was in the paper lay in its brevity and controversial temper.

Browning is so often condemned unread, and so many people's acquaintance with Browning is nowadays confined to two stock jokes about 'Sordello' that I may be allowed to record here two rather obvious replies to Mr. Hudson's remarks. Very few people have ever read, or ever will read, 'Sordello,' in which Browning was caricaturing his worst manner, so it is a mistake to quote 'Sordello' as characteristic of his poetry. There is an essential difference between the 'difficult' passages in Browning and those in most recent poetry. In Browning you always find a sound kernel of thought to repay you for the time spent in cracking the nut, whereas, after wrestling with the obscurities of modern verse, you find too often a rotten kernel, or none at all.

With reference to Miss Dallas Kenmare's criticism: it is clear that she and I agree in distinguishing between Mr. Eliot to-day and Mr. Eliot ten years ago. We appear to differ as to which Mr. Eliot is influencing young poets to-day. I notice that a reviewer in the latest number of *New Verse* writes: '"Murder in the Cathedral" is country-house charades performed by elderly, rheumatic folk.' This confirms my impression that our young poets regard the new Mr. Eliot as old-fashioned, though they are still under the influence of his earlier work. That is why I referred specially to the contents of the 1909-25 volume. (I acknowledge Miss Kenmare's correction of the date in the title.)

I *had* read 'Murder in the Cathedral' with great pleasure, also some of Mr. Eliot's other more recent work. This Miss Kenmare might have inferred from my expression of opinion that 'until Mr. Eliot took to drama his prose was better worth reading than his verse.' That is indirect but definite praise of Mr. Eliot's later verse, for he is a master of prose. I admit that I had not read the *Collected Poems* (they had not yet been published), or enough of Mr. Eliot's work to justify any definite appraisement. That was not my theme, and I did not attempt it.

Miss Kenmare attributes to me words ('Eliot is definitely a bad influence') which I quoted as 'perhaps' true from what Mr. J. B. Priestley wrote a year ago. Miss Kenmare's own opinion that Eliot is 'at the present time the best possible influence' appears to be based on the poet's religious convictions. Mr. Priestley's contrary opinion was not based on the poet's opinions, but on his 'low boiling-point,' *i.e.* his natural coldness of temperament. Mr. Eliot is now forty-eight years of age, so this defect is not likely to decrease with years, but let us hope Mr. Priestley will prove wrong and Miss Kenmare right.

Mr. Eliot was not the subject of my short paper. If my incidental allusions did him less than justice, I hope Miss Kenmare's tribute may serve as an antidote.

J. P. Bulkeley.

Mount View, Tiverton, Devon.
June 4th, 1936.

SOVIET COMMUNISM: A NEW CIVILIZATION?

Sir,

Will you allow me space to attempt an answer to Canon Palmer's sweeping condemnation of the Russian Church, and of Russian religion in general, which appears on pp. 111-112 of the April-May issue of the *Modern Churchman*?

The Russian political experiment is undoubtedly of tremendous interest and significance; but I feel that Modern Churchmen should not permit their enthusiasm to run away with their judgment or outweigh their distaste for persecution.

(1) Sidney and Beatrice Webb have unrivalled qualifications for describing in detail a great political and social experiment. But they make no pretence of knowing the Russian language, and they depend for their facts upon informants. Those informants, though doubtless competent and reliable on the political side, are unlikely to be without prejudice in matters of religion. The quotations from the Webbs' book and from a paper by the Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of London are, indeed, so sweepingly condemnatory as to invite suspicion.

(2) Two outstanding English authorities who have lived in Russia and speak the language can be quoted in refutation: Sir Bernard Pares in *My Russian Memoirs* and Mr. Maurice Baring in *What I saw in Russia.* The novels of Dostoievsky, also, give an impression of Russian religion under the Tsars, from a not uncritical point of view, which is very different from that of the Webbs.

(3) It is not generally realised that the Russian Church, from the time of Peter the Great to the Revolution, was under a repressive lay political domination. In spite of this there was a strong movement for freedom and reform, and the Church did, indeed, welcome the Menshevik revolution.

(4) The Russian Church has suffered much in the West from the sinister reputation of Rasputin. But Rasputin was not a priest. The Russian priest-

hood was far from being degraded and illiterate. It would not be difficult to find Roman and even Anglican priests whom Modern Churchmen would regard as teaching and practising a primitive and superstitious form of religion. In a country as vast and backward as was Tsarist Russia one would expect to find the same thing. But it is unfair to judge a Church by its least developed representatives, and to do so in this case is to ignore a long and splendid tradition of mysticism and sanctity.

(5) The Church which has shown such vitality under persecution as the Russian Church, which has produced so many modern martyrs, and which numbers among its leaders such outstanding thinkers as Professor N. Berdyaev and Father Sergius Bulgakov should surely be entitled to look to Modern Churchmen for sympathy and friendliness, if not always for agreement. A reading of Father Bulgakov's study of *The Orthodox Church,* while it will doubtless reveal many points on which most Modern Churchmen would disagree with him, at least reveals an aspect and interpretation of Christianity worthy of respect from all thoughtful Christians.

RALPH GARDNER.

The Vicarage, South Benfleet, Essex.
May 11th, 1936.

ECRASEZ L'INFAME.

SIR,

A perusal of the review of H. N. Brailsford's *Voltaire* prompts me to ask what is the real meaning of the phrase *écrasez l'infâme,* which occurs so frequently in Voltaire's letters and works. Professor Saintsbury in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and Mrs. Brailsford take the view that *l'infâme* does not mean God, Christ or Christianity, or even Catholicism, but is equivalent to persecuting and privileged orthodoxy in general, and more particularly that system which Voltaire saw around him.

On the other hand, Salomon Reinach (*Orpheus,* p. 384) writes: 'By *écrasez l'infâme* he meant not only fanaticism and superstition but Christianity. He called himself a deist. The God of Voltaire was a prop of the social system — a *Dieu-gendarme.*'

Reinach considers Voltaire a buffoon, and sycophantic to the great. Benjamin Jowett, on the other hand, says: 'Voltaire has done more good than all the Fathers of the Church put together' (*Life,* I, p. 38).

A. M. COLEMAN.

IN MEMORIAN: Rev. A. H. STANWAY.

SIR,

As Secretary of the Purley Modern Churchmen's Union Branch, may I record our indebtedness to our first President and one of the veterans of the Union, the Rev. A. H. Stanway, and express our great loss due to his recent death? It was his initial support and help which made it possible for us, ten years ago, to found our branch, as members of the Union were then few and far between, though a number of others at once joined, and his well-considered contributions at our meetings were always a source of strength. We all remember him with deep gratitude.

ARTHUR FLOYD.

46 Downs Court Road, Purley, Surrey.
June 2nd, 1936.